LUNDS UNIVERSITETS ÅRSSKRIFT. N. F. Avd 1. Bd 47. Nr 5.

THE SERVANT SONGS IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH

A NEW ATTEMPT TO SOLVE AN OLD PROBLEM

BY

JOH. LINDBLOM

BS
1520
L5
9
2

LUND
C. W. K. GLEERUP

LUNDS UNIVERSITETS ÅRSSKRIFT. N. F. Avd. 1. Bd 47. Nr 5.

THE SERVANT SONGS IN DEUTERO-ISAIAH

A NEW ATTEMPT TO SOLVE AN OLD PROBLEM

BY

JOH. LINDBLOM

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

LUND
C. W. K. GLEERUP

DN39
L942

LUND
HÅKAN OHLSSONS BOKTRYCKERI
1951

Contents.

Chapter I. The Problem 7

Chapter II. The Literary Character of the Ebed-Yahweh Songs . . 12

1. First Song: XLII.1—4. 14
2. Second Song: XLIX.1—6 24
3. Third Song: L.4—9 32
4. Fourth Song: LII.13—LIII.12 37

Chapter III. The Leading Ideas of the Ebed-Yahweh Oracles as Elements in the Message of Deutero-Isaiah 52

Chapter IV. The Use of Figurative Language in Deutero-Isaiah . . 75

Chapter V. The Problem of Eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah 94

Conclusion 102

List of Works Consulted 105

Index of Authors 110

Index of Scripture Passages 112

20526

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

https://archive.org/details/servantsongsinde00unse

Preface.

It is not my intention that this book should offer a final solution to an old problem; it is rather an *attempt* at a new solution. It may be considered as a contribution to the keen and prolonged discussion concerning the Servant of the Lord as portrayed in the 'Ebed-Yahweh Songs' in Deutero-Isaiah.

I wish to acknowledge my indebtedness to Professor Christopher R. North of Bangor for the survey of the earlier interpretations which he has so admirably presented in his book *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah* (1948), which has inspired this new investigation.

I also wish to acknowledge my gratitude to Professor G. W. Anderson of Birmingham for his painstaking reading of the manuscript, and his many helpful suggestions in improving the English. He has also kindly read a proof. It is the author's hope that the English reader will not find this treatise too tiresome to read.

The titles of books, periodicals, and annuals have generally been written out in full. In certain instances I have, however, made use of commonly known abbreviations. *The Journal of Theological Studies* I have represented by 'JTS', *Journal of Biblical Literature* by 'JBL', *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* by 'ZAW', *Gesenius-Kautzsch, Hebräische Grammatik,* by 'G-K', etc. *The St. Mark's Isaiah manuscript* I have designated with the letters 'DSIa', and the text used in this instance is taken from Millar Burrows' edition in *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery,* Vol. I (New Haven 1950).

Lund, December 1950.

Joh. Lindblom

Chapter I.

The Problem.

This study would not have been written if Professor Christopher North had not published his book *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. An Historical and Critical Study*, London 1948. After studying that book, outstanding alike for thoroughness and learning, I am left with a vivid impression of the uncertainty and disagreement attached to the whole problem of the Ebed-Yahweh figure in Deutero-Isaiah and to the passages which describe him. Professor North has rendered us good service in giving us an admirable review of the attempts made from early times up to the present day to understand this 'Servant of the Lord'. To this review he also adds a constructive statement and interpretations which are of permanent value. With regard to Ebed Yahweh he has given us something analogous to the famous book by Albert Schweitzer *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*. In both cases we hear much of mistakes which must not be repeated, resources which are exhausted, and ways which lead nowhere. Such historico-critical reviews are eminently useful to scientific investigation. They compel us to track out new ways and search for hitherto untried solutions of the problems, or humbly to admit that the problems in question are simply insoluble.

I am not sure that Professor North's own proposals and interpretations will in every respect prove to be the last word.

North reckons with four 'Servant Songs': XLII.1—4, XLIX.1—6, L.4—9, and LII.13—LIII.12. These pieces are identical with Bernhard Duhm's well-known 'Ebed-Jahve-Lieder'. Other passages which various scholars regard as Servant Songs have, according to North, nothing to do with the Servant proper. Some of them originally related to Israel and were subsequently transformed into secondary Servant Songs.

Having in this way reduced the Servant Songs to their original extent, Professor North undertakes an analysis of the figure depicted in the Songs. The servant of the Songs is essentially different from the Servant of the Lord who is spoken about in other parts of the book. The servant

of the Songs is an anonymous individual, delineated with somewhat varying traits in the different Songs, but nevertheless forming a characteristic entity. North uses the likeness of a cathedral, constituting a single building, but composed of different, at times disparate, elements. The figure of Ebed Yahweh has the traits of a prophet, but also those of a king. He has a double task: he has a mission to Israel, but also to the Gentiles. He is an instrument in Yahweh's hand for bringing salvation to the Jews as well as to the heathen. He is persecuted and insulted. He despairs of his capacity to bring his task to a successful end, but becomes strengthened and encouraged by Yahweh. Having failed in relation to his own people, he is going to be a light for the pagan nations. Finally he is ordered by Yahweh to endure grievous affliction, including actual death and burial. He becomes a man upon whom every conceivable indignity is heaped. As recompense the servant is to be glorified through returning from the grave to this earth and to see abundant seed signifying a spiritual posterity.

This Servant of Yahweh is not a historical individual. He is described in more than human terms. Nor is he a mythological figure, like Tammuz in Babylonian religion; though it may be that there are several similarities between Tammuz and the Suffering Servant. He is not Israel, nor a part of Israel, nor the 'ideal Israel'; he is an individual person who has not yet appeared, but belongs to the future. He represents a plus beyond all historical facts. He is a Messianic figure, but not the Messiah of Isa. IX and XI. Though there are undoubtedly kingly features in the servant, there is nothing in the Songs to indicate that he was an anointed king. The servant, says Professor North, is a soteriological rather than a political Messianic figure (p. 218).

The Songs were, according to North, all composed by Deutero-Isaiah himself, probably at intervals, and rather later than the rest of the prophecies. And he continues: They are 'born of an intense anguish of soul, anguish such as the Prophet must have experienced when Cyrus, whom he had expected to be a kind of first-fruits of Yahwism among the Gentiles, proclaimed instead his enthusiasm for Bel-Marduk' (p. 217).

I have reproduced Professor North's view at some length, because it is the one most recently put forward in a major work on Ebed Yahweh, and is the result of the most exhaustive and careful critical review of earlier positions that has ever been carried out. North says somewhere, 'There is no theory that has been altogether immune from criticism'. Is his own theory an exception? Many objections have in fact been raised, in the past, against the Messianic interpretation of the Servant Songs, and North himself admits that this interpretation is bound up with seve-

ral difficulties. I am convinced that in the future arguments will again be advanced against it. It may be that the Messianic interpretation of the figure in LII.13—LIII.12, and, perhaps, of the servant in XLII. 1—4 can count upon some approval; but there will always be some scholars who are reluctant to interpret in the same way the pictures of XLIX.1—6 and L.4—9 because of their autobiographical form. If the servant is thought of as a coming Messiah, what natural explanation is there for the fact that in these passages he suddenly appears speaking in the first person about experiences he has had while performing his Messianic work?

And, above all, if the Servant Songs have reference to the Messiah, how can we explain their place in the actual context? Gressmann[1] is undoubtedly right in understanding the Book of Deutero-Isaiah as a collection of relatively small units without any firmly coherent structure. However, the researches of Mowinckel[2] and other scholars have shown that the units have not been mingled together at random like the grains in a mound of sand: they have been joined together according to certain principles, related either to form or to content.

To my mind President Kissane goes too far in building up the Book of Deutero-Isaiah according to a firm, regular, and stately scheme.[3] *Inter alia* I cannot share his opinion on certain major exegetical questions, which are fundamental to his construction (e.g. the interpretation of XLI.1—4 and 25—26 as referring to Abraham, not to Cyrus). But a careful study will undoubtedly bring to light that, in fact, there exists a certain order, if not in the book as a whole, at any rate in the arrangement of the individual oracles in relation to each other. Kissane is absolutely right in laying stress upon the importance of the context and the coherence between the different pieces for a correct exegetical understanding of details.

This being so, it will be very difficult to explain for what reason the presumed 'Messianic' pieces should have been placed just where they now

---

[1] 'Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas', *ZAW*, 34, 1914, pp. 254—297.

[2] 'Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches', *ZAW*, 49, 1931, pp. 87—112, 242—260. Mowinckel, however, goes too far in the application of his 'catchword' theory. The similarity of subject-matter has played a much greater rôle as a principle of association in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah than Mowinckel thinks, as will be seen from the following examination.

[3] *The Book of Isaiah. Vol. II.* Dublin 1943. Irrespective of the fact that I am very grateful for many fine observations in this book, I must most decidedly reject the strange view of the origin of the second part of the Book of Isaiah which is expounded by the author on pp. LVIII—LXI. So much is clear, at any rate, that 'the Second Isaiah' was, in some measure, a disciple of Isaiah, the son of Amoz.

stand. As 'Messianic' oracles they must make the impression of having in reality been dispersed at random in the book: they appear so abruptly, and interrupt the continuity of the context in such a manner that nothing quite like this is to be found in the rest of the book. So far as I understand, Professor North has too lightly passed over this difficulty.

To my mind no solution of the Ebed-Yahweh problem is fully satisfactory that has not taken into consideration the light that is thrown upon the Songs by the context. On this major point I agree with Kissane in his Commentary, although I differ from him in details.

In spite of all that we are grateful for in Professor North's book, several problems remain unsolved; and what is more, after studying his book, the reader comes willy-nilly to suspect that the problem of 'the servant' in Deutero-Isaiah is simply insoluble by the methods hitherto applied. He asks himself: Is it possible that the ever recurring question: 'Who is the Servant?' is an erroneous one? Professor North's book has given us evidence that through obstinately searching for an answer to that question, we are ending in chaos. In scientific research it is very often useful, and indeed necessary, to put the question in an entirely new manner. In my opinion the principal question concerning the Ebed-Yahweh problem must be: *What is the literary character of the Ebed Songs*? Not until we have found an answer to this question, can we get a starting point for a successful attempt to interpret the servant figure himself.

On the whole, it is an indispensable duty in all historical research dealing with texts to determine the literary nature of the text in question. Large constructions have often been built up on texts which in consequence of their nature have not been able to bear them. It is dangerous to treat a legend as a historical document. It would be pointless to interpret a parable of Jesus as if it were a historical narrative. It would lead to absurdities if anyone should take our actual Book of Job as a purely historical document. A good many mistakes as to the Patriarchal stories of the book of Genesis would have been avoided, if it had always been realized that they are Hebrew parallels to the Arabic ancestral traditions, i.e. the traditions about the more or less imaginary primitive sheikhs of the Bedouin tribes.[4]

My first task will consequently be to examine the literary character of the Servant Songs. Too much stress should not be laid on the word 'literary'. In using this word I think only of what the Germans call

[4] Cf. E. Bräunlich, 'Beiträge zur Gesellschaftsordnung der arabischen Beduinenstämme', *Islamica*, 6, 1934, pp. 68—141, 182—229; J. Lindblom, *Israels religion i gammaltestamentlig tid*, Stockholm 1936, pp. 13f.

'Gattung', and I leave open the question whether the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah were communicated as oral messages or in written form. This question has little import for the present study. In my opinion there is no essential difference between Deutero-Isaiah and the other prophets with regard to the methods employed in order to influence their compatriots. The nameless messenger of the exile was in reality a prophet. He was a poet, it is true, but his poetical gift affected in the first place *the form* of his messages. There is also a rhetorical trait in him, but the rhetorical character refers to his style.[5] He must be called a prophet because he was compelled by the divine power, and because he felt called by Yahweh to be His messenger to the chosen people in a momentous historical situation. It may be that ecstasy proper did not play any important rôle in his life; but he had the gift of inspiration, and, as we shall see in what follows, he had many experiences typical of the prophetical mentality. That will be brought to light through a close study of the texts. I think that like all prophets of ancient or modern times the prophet of the exile spoke publicly to his compatriots, but the actual conditions of the Babylonian captivity rendered it necessary even in his lifetime for some of his messages to be written down and in that form circulate among the dispersed exiles. If the prophet himself had carried out the collection of his oracles, they would surely have been arranged in a better order. The collection, oral or written, is the work of his disciples and adherents. When it was completed we do not know.[6]

After all that has been written about the Ebed-Yahweh figure in Deutero-Isaiah, it will perhaps seem audacious to present a new attempt to solve the problem. I hope that my study will be taken simply as a contribution to the discussion about this central theme of Old Testament research. Professor North's book discharges me from giving a comprehensive account of earlier theories, and also makes it possible for me to reduce discussion with other scholars to the minimum. The value of my theories, it is to be hoped, will manifest itself through their own convincing force and their power to surmount the difficulties better than earlier views.

[5] Cf. L. Köhler, *Deuterojesaja (Jesaja 40—55), stilkritisch untersucht* (Beih. z. ZAW, 37), Giessen 1923, pp. 80ff.

[6] Important remarks concerning the transmission of the oracles belonging to the Isaianic circles are to be found in I. Engnell, 'The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in »Deutero-Isaiah»', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 31, 1948, pp. 54—93.

Chapter II.

The Literary Character of the Ebed-Yahweh Songs.

Bernhard Duhm, the first scholar who clearly distinguished the Ebed-Yahweh Songs as separate pieces, found their common characteristic in the fact that they all deal with a certain historical person, a teacher of the law ('Thoralehrer'), called to carry out a mission to his own people and then to the heathen, working unobtrusively, a martyr for his faith, smitten by leprosy, guiltless, yet dying for the benefit of his sinful people, and in the end glorified[1]. Professor North accepts Duhm's delimitation of the Songs though he claims that they belong to the authentic oracles of Deutero-Isaiah, while Duhm attributed them to an author living in post-exilic times. According to Professor North, what connects the Songs as a separate group among the Deutero-Isaianic oracles, is the idea of a Messianic figure, belonging to the future, who through his activities and his sufferings will be an instrument in Yahweh's hand for bringing salvation to Israel and the pagan nations. In my opinion, too, the Songs form a special group among the poems contained in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah, but to me the connecting idea of the sublime poems is not the 'Thoralehrer', nor the Messianic figure, nor a special hero at all, it is the literary character of the pieces and the rôle they play in the context. That my division does not on all points coincide with the division made by Duhm and North will appear from the following exegetical examination. But in broad outline the traditional Servant Songs must form the basis of the present investigation.

For a successful examination of the literary character of the Servant Songs it is necessary to discard the assumption that the subject of the Songs must be everywhere the same. It is indeed an odd fact that the majority of scholars who have been occupied with the Ebed-Yahweh problem have, without further argument, maintained that 'the servant' is identical in the four Songs, although they offer the most varying answers to the question who this servant is. The opinion that the hero

[1] *Das Buch Jesaia, übersetzt und erklärt*, Göttingen 1892.

of the Songs is everywhere the same has in reality become a fetter to scholars. This way of solving the problem has proved to be a path of error leading to something like chaos. However, single voices have been heard pleading for another view: each Song must be interpreted separately by itself; and we have to take into account the fact that the 'servant' is to be variously identified in the different Songs.

P. Volz in his great Commentary broke the fetters and ventured to maintain that there were different servants. He saw in the three first Songs autobiographical descriptions of the experiences of the prophet composed by himself; in the fourth Song he detected a coming saviour. The innocently suffering servant of chapter LIII is, according to Volz, an eschatological figure, an instrument in Yahweh's hand for the salvation of mankind. This poem is not the work of Deutero-Isaiah; it is probably from the hand of an author of the fourth or third century B. C.[2] In my Swedish book on the Israelite prophets I presented a similar interpretation, yet without expressing an opinion as to the authorship of the fourth Song.[3]

President Kissane goes farther. He emphasizes that each Song must be interpreted separately with regard to the context. 'The servant' is not one and the same. The servant of the first and second Song is Israel, the speaker in the third Song is the prophet himself, the suffering servant of chapter LIII is the Messiah of the future. Kissane says correctly, 'The context is the guide to the interpretation, and disregard of the context leads to chaos.'[4] He is right in maintaining that the hero is not the same in all four Songs. But he is wrong in asking, '*Who* is the servant?', before having cleared up the literary nature of the Servant texts. Therefore his solution of the main problem — and of other problems connected with it — cannot be satisfactory but likewise ends in — 'chaos.'

---

[2] *Jesaia II, übersetzt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1932. Before Volz various scholars discerned different Ebed figures in the Songs. E.g. W. Staerk in *Die Ebed Jahwe-Lieder in Jesaja 40ff.*, Leipzig 1913, conceived the servant of the first three Songs as a prophetic Messiah, modelled after the figure of Jeremiah, and the suffering man of the fourth Song as a martyr-king identified with Jehoiachin. The Songs were from an age previous to that of Deutero-Isaiah, and they were later inserted in Isa. XL—LV. Staerk, it is true, later altered this view.

[3] J. Lindblom, *Profetismen i Israel*, Stockholm 1934, pp. 205ff., 580f. Similarly W. F. Lofthouse says that it is very difficult to deny the independence of the fourth Song, 'Some Reflections on the Servant Songs', *JTS*, XLVIII, 1947, pp. 169—176.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. LXVIII. Engnell, *op. cit.*, likewise emphasizes energetically the importance of the context for the understanding of the Servant Songs, though he arrives at quite different results.

Whether the subject in the four Songs is the same or not will appear from the following exegetical examination. Any preconceived opinion on this point is unjustified. But this question can only be given an answer in connection with the examination of the literary nature of the Songs, and of the reason for their position in the actual context. I propose now to examine the four Songs in turn from these points of view.

1. First Song: XLII. 1—4.

Almost all scholars who have been interested in the problems connected with the composition of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah have felt the difficulty of explaining for what reason the Ebed-Yahweh Songs are placed just where they now stand. The most forced expedients have been tried. One of those who have had the clearest insight into the problem, and have most frankly expressed the difficulty of finding a logical or real connection between the Ebed-Yahweh Songs and their context, was P. Volz. He says in his Commentary that there is no answer to the question why the Ebed-Yahweh Songs were inserted in their present contexts, and that we shall never get to know with what intention Deutero-Isaiah, or another, put them there.[5]

This judgment seems to be incontestable on the presumption that the Songs are to be taken as independent poems. But there are other possibilities, which will become obvious from a careful examination of the texts.

The first Song contains an utterance of Yahweh. With the expression הן Yahweh presents somebody whose character and work are described in what follows. הן and הנה are favourite words in Deutero-Isaiah for laying stress upon remarkable facts.[6] Here הן is used as a formula of introduction, as is the case in XL.9: הנה אלהיכם, 'here is your God'. Yahweh calls the person to be introduced His 'servant'. To whom is the servant introduced? Several answers have been given to this question: a supra-

[5] *Op. cit.*, p. XXXVII. Cf. W. O. E. Oesterley and T. H. Robinson, *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, London 1934, p. 273: 'Each of these four pieces stands independent and could be taken out of its present position without affecting the contents.' Similarly J. S. van der Ploeg, *Les chants du serviteur de Jahvé dans la seconde partie du livre d' Isaïe*, Paris 1936, pp. 16ff. Lofthouse in his just cited article says, 'When once the Songs have been removed, 2 Isa. is one of the most homogeneous, as it is one of the most clearly differentiated, sections of the O.T. ... Embedded in these closely knit chapters, the four Songs are readily detachable', pp. 170f.

[6] *hēn* occurs seventeen times in Deutero-Isaiah; in all other parts of the prophetic literature thirteen times only. DSIa generally changes *hēn* into *hinnêh*.

mundane assembly,[7] the nations of the world, and so on; or else the commentators simply pass over the question in silence. It is difficult to understand why the commentators do not agree on pointing to the prophet himself as the object of the address, indubitably the simplest answer to the question. It is a well-known fact that the bulk of the oracles in the prophetic literature consists either of revelations from Yahweh to the prophets or messages to the people from the prophets as Yahweh's mouthpieces. Very often in Deutero-Isaiah the oracles are marked as divine utterances by the formula 'thus says Yahweh' (כה אמר יהוה). But in Deutero-Isaiah such a formula is frequently missing. For that reason it is often very difficult to distinguish the different oracles in this book from each other. Phrases such as 'Yahweh said unto me' or 'Yahweh's word came' do not occur in Deutero-Isaiah at all. The revelations to the prophet are generally inserted without any introductory formula whatever. That is the case in XLII.1. The passage XLII.1—4 must be interpreted as a revelation from Yahweh to the prophet, just as if it had been introduced by 'Yahweh said unto me' or 'Yahweh's word came unto me', or a similar expression.

The person introduced by Yahweh to the prophet is called a servant of Yahweh. He is Yahweh's agent, and a divine charge is committed to him. The following statements (אתמך בו is a relative clause, the principal sentence following in v. 1 b) give us a description of his task and his endowment for the performance of this task. 'Chosen' (בחיר) is used of Israel, the elect people, but also of individuals like David and Moses. Yahweh has selected and appointed His servant among men to perform a special commission in His service. And for that reason Yahweh has endowed him with His spirit. The verb אתמך likewise refers to the appointing of the servant to his ministry. Yahweh has taken him by the hand and supports him.[8]

The mission of the servant is first indicated by the phrase (לגוים) משפט יוציא (vv. 1 and 3). What does this phrase mean? Several times in the Old Testament משפט and synonymous words are connected with יצא or

[7] So e.g. North, *op. cit.*, p. 142.

[8] Cf. J. Begrich, *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*, Stuttgart 1938, p. 161. The expressions here used belong according to Gressmann to the Oriental 'court-style'; see *Der Messias*, Göttingen 1929, p. 60. Cf. S. Smith, *Isaiah Chapters XL—LV*, London 1944, pp. 59 and 180. For these terms as belonging to the kingship ideology see further C. Lindhagen, *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament. A Preliminary Study to the 'Ebed-Yahweh Problem' in Deutero-Isaiah*. Uppsala 1950, p. 206. This book contains an extremely comprehensive investigation of the notion 'Ebed' in the Old Testament with the exception of the Ebed-Yahweh Songs in Deutero-Isaiah.

הוציא signifying 'go forth', 'be made known, manifest', and 'bring forth', 'make known, manifest, valid' (Ps. XVII.2, XXXVII.6; Isa. LI.4; Jer. LI.10; Hab. I.4,7). Thus the servant's task is to bring forth and vindicate to the nations of the world what is right, that is, the statutes and ordinances of Yahweh, including, of course, belief in Him. In v. 4 the same idea recurs in a slightly different form: he will establish the right, that is institute in the earth the sum-total of divine requirements. This is to my mind the best translation of the words ישׂים במשפט בארץ.[9]

In v. 3 it is said that the servant will perform his task לאמת, i.e. in accordance with the demands of the truth, the expression referring to the manner in which the servant performs his task of establishing the laws (not to the character of the servant himself), including what is said in the preceding line: 'a reed that is bruised he shall not break, and a wick that burns dimly he shall not quench'.

Those much discussed words must be explained in the light of the surrounding juridical terms. The establishment of the divine laws obviously includes the dispensation of justice, the propagator of the divine law being a judge as well, pronouncing judgments according to the demands of the law. The words discussed give in a symbolic manner

---

[9] *mišpāṭ* and *tôrâh* are often interpreted as signifying the true religion, belief in Yahweh (Volz, Kissane etc.). If the servant is thought of as a king, as is most likely, it is better to translate the words as has been done above. For the ideas in question see further W. Hertzberg, *ZAW*, 41, 1923, pp. 41ff., and J. van der Ploeg in *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, II, Leiden 1943 pp. 144—155. Begrich, who thinks that *mišpāṭ* signifies 'judgment', or rather 'sentence', maintains that the servant's charge is to make known in the world Yahweh's sentence pronounced over Israel. Accordingly he translates v. 3b: he (the servant) makes known the sentence as a just one. The last line of the Song, however, goes against this conception of the passage. Here it is obviously indicated that *mišpaṭ* and *tôrâh* are more comprehensive ideas. What the Gentiles wait for is not a sentence of Yahweh referring to Israel, but the knowledge of the will and the demands of the God of the heavens (*op. cit.*, pp. 135f., 161ff.). — A rather original interpretation is suggested by N. H. Snaith, 'The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah', *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor T. H. Robinson*, Edinburgh 1950, pp. 193f. Snaith thinks that the task of the servant is to dispense justice to the Gentiles. The Second Isaiah, as an essentially nationalistic prophet, speaks here of an execution of justice in the sense of strict retribution (לאמת). That the Gentiles 'wait' signifies that they wait with dread. But how does Snaith explain the words: 'He shall not cry, not make any clamour, nor let his voice be heard in the street'? — DSIa has in v. 1 ומשפטי; the meaning is the same. In v. 4 the same manuscript has ינחילו, an error of the copyist, and the plural תורתיו, probably because in the circle to which he belonged the singular was reserved for the Mosaic law. See J. Lindblom, 'Die Ebed Jahwe-Orakel in der neuentdeckten Jesajahandschrift (DSIa)', *ZAW*, 63, 1951.

expression to the thought that the servant-judge will not wrest and pervert the right of the poor and defenceless: he will not make their hard lot still more deplorable. To my mind this is the most simple and natural interpretation of the metaphorical phrases in question. The description of the Messianic king in Isa. XI.3—4 provides a good commentary on our passage.[10]

Lastly it is said that the coasts wait eagerly for his law. 'His law' is the divine law, established among the Gentiles by the servant. There is no essential difference between *tôrâh* and *mišpāṭ*, the latter word including likewise all the demands of the divine law.

Two sentences still remain to be explained. The servant does not burn dimly, nor is himself bruised until he has performed his work: supported by Yahweh he overcomes all possible resistance; he is not thrown down, but stands firm and endures.[11] Finally, he does not cry nor make any clamour, nor let his voice be heard in the street: his methods, when bringing forth the divine law, are not those of a tyrannical and fierce conqueror at the head of his truculent troops; he will go to work peaceably and gently. In this description the servant of ch. XLII.1—4 is characterized as some kind of conqueror in the service of Yahweh, the heavenly King. By peaceful means he will conquer the world and subdue the nations, and his goal is to get the laws and ordinances of his Lord known and accepted among the nations of the earth.

---

[10] Begrich, *op. cit.*, presents a very original interpretation of the expressions in v. 3a. He holds that there existed a custom that judicial sentences were proclaimed in the open street and confirmed by the breaking of the staff and extinguishing of the lamp of the person condemned. Yahweh will not repeat the sentence which He has already passed on Israel. In reality it is Yahweh's pardon of Israel that will be announced by the servant in the world. Irrespective of the uncertainty of the supposed practice, the usefulness of Begrich's suggestion depends entirely on the explanation of the ideas *mišpāṭ* and *tôrâh* offered by him. If these words signify in fact anything else than Yahweh's sentence over Israel, Begrich's proposal becomes meaningless. For the explanation of what is said about the reed and the wick we may recall what Gressmann has to tell us about the common symbols of the reed and the lamp in the literature of the ancient Orient in *Der Messias*, p. 290. Gressmann thinks that v. 3a in this context is entirely unintelligible, and changes the verbal forms from the third person into the first, *op. cit.*, p. 287, n. 1. To him the servant is a 'Weltmissionar', who must use other methods. If the servant is a judge, the description of his conduct is quite appropriate.

[11] C. C. Torrey holds with some justification that there is no place for any allusion to weakness or suffering on the part of the servant in this sketch, *The Second Isaiah*, Edinburgh 1928, pp. 325f. But, as we shall see in the following, the description of the servant is allegorical, and in the expressions mentioned a feature of the historical reality gleams through.

We cannot fail to observe that here the figure of the servant is delineated against the background of the victorious and triumphant Cyrus. The servant is intentionally painted in contrast with the Persian king-conqueror.[12] I think we are not mistaken in supposing that the servant likewise is thought of as a king-conqueror, a kind of vassal-king in the service of Yahweh, the King of heaven, entrusted with the mission of making the nations subject to the laws and will of his Lord and Sovereign.[13]

The above seems to me to be a fair interpretation of the picture of the servant of the first Servant Song.

This revelation concerning the servant-king comes quite unexpectedly and has no connection with the foregoing verses, XLI.21—29. That passage contains a challenge to the pagan gods — 'Gerichtsrede', as the Germans say. They have no power to control the events of history or to foretell what is to come. None of the pagan gods has foretold the appearing of Cyrus. They have had nothing to proclaim: they are unable to say anything or to do anything whatever. Yahweh alone has foretold the wonderful events of contemporary history and sent a messenger to Jerusalem announcing them.

That section and the following revelation about the servant-king have nothing in common. The leading ideas of the former passage are the astounding appearance of Cyrus, which is naturally followed by the

[12] This is strongly emphasized particularly by J. Hempel. See 'Vom irrenden Glauben', *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*, 7, 1929—1930, pp. 631—660.

[13] The kingly features in the servant of Isa. XLII have in an increasing degree been observed by recent writers. While Volz in 1932 regarded the servant exclusively as a missionary, and a spiritual guide of souls, in 1929 Gressmann had already said concerning the 'Weltmissionar': he is simply thought of as a king; *op.cit.*, p. 289. According to Aage Bentzen, *Jesaja, 2, Jes. 40—66*, Köbenhavn 1943, p. 32, the servant is described as a prophet, but with regal features. See also *Messias. Moses redivivus. Menschensohn*, Zürich 1948, pp. 42ff. The kingly character of the servant in Isa. XLII is further emphasized by Engnell in the article mentioned above, by North, *op. cit.*, pp. 139ff., and several others. G. Östborn, *Tōrā in the Old Testament*, Lund 1945, pp. 57ff., makes several valuable remarks on the king as imparter of *tôrâh*. See however S. Mowinckel in *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, XIII, 1948, pp. 76ff., who on many points criticizes the contentions of Östborn. Against Mowinckel it may be objected that if the servant of ch. XLII is thought of as a vassal-king, it does not follow that the servant in all Songs is a king. It may be that in Israel the king was not a law-giver; but throughout the ancient Orient he was. S. Smith, *op. cit.*, pp. 54ff., goes so far that he identifies the servant with Cyrus (so earlier W. E. Barnes, *JTS*, 32, 1931, pp. 32ff.). That is a mistake, but the observation of the kingly features is correct. — The researches of C. Lindhagen, *op. cit.*, make it evident that the term 'servant' even in ancient times was used exactly of vassal-kings in relation to their sovereigns, pp. 19ff.

deliverance of the captive Jews, and the complete impotence of the pagan gods. The leading idea of the latter passage is the work of the servant-king in making Yahweh's demands known and accepted among the Gentiles. Volz is quite right in maintaining that there does not exist any natural connection between these two sections. According to Mowinckel XLII. 1—4 has got its place here because of a gross misinterpretation: the 'redactor' of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah falsely identified the hero (Cyrus) of ch. XLI.21—29 and XLII.5—9 with the servant of XLII. 1—4.[14] This explanation is a pure makeshift. It is not very probable that anybody was so stupid as to confuse two so dissimilar figures as the fierce conqueror of ch. XLI and the meek propagator of the divine *tôrâh* of ch. XLII.

Bentzen has likewise discussed, at some length, the relation between the two sections in question. He holds that the מבשר of XLI.27 and the servant of the Ebed Song are identical, both referring to the prophet himself.[15] That the bearer of glad tidings is the nameless prophet of the exile is, indeed, very likely. That the vassal-king XLII.1ff. is the prophet is a highly precarious assumption. If it is possible to find a better solution of the problem, it must be sought.

There is, in fact, such a better solution, namely, not to take XLII. 1—4 as a separate piece, but to combine it with the following revelation XLII.5—9. The formula 'Thus says the God Yahweh' marks the beginning of this second revelation, and the words 'Sing to Yahweh a new song' v. 10 indicate that here a new unit begins, ending with 'Let them give glory to Yahweh' etc. v. 12.

It is very interesting to see how the passage 5—9 has been treated, or even maltreated, by scholars who have attempted to elucidate the composition of Deutero-Isaiah. In general it has been observed that there exists a close similarity between the contents of 5—9 and the contents of the preceding Servant Song. In both cases reference is made to someone called by Yahweh to carry out a mission to the nations and for that purpose upheld by him. Duhm, who limits the section to verses 5—7, regards it as a late addition by an author identical neither with Deutero-Isaiah nor with the composer of the Ebed-Yahweh Songs. One feels tempted to ask for what reason such an addition could have been made. Staerk regards 5—9 as an addition to 1—4, applying to Israel what was said of the prophet-Messiah in the preceding Song.[16] Other scholars regard XLII.5—9, or 5—7, as an independent Ebed-

[14] *ZAW*, 49, 1931, p. 245.

[15] *Jesaja*, *2*, pp. 29ff.

[16] *Op. cit.*, passim.

Yahweh Song in addition to the other Songs, so e.g. Gressmann, Volz and Bentzen. According to North we have in XLII.5—9, which reads almost like a continuation of XLII.1—4, an oracle originally relating to Israel, and subsequently transformed into a secondary Servant Song.[17] Kissane takes XLII.1—4 and 5—9 closely together, as both dealing with the purpose of Israel's election. Israel is to be sent to reveal to the nations the knowledge of the true God; and the same God who called Israel in the person of Abraham (v.6) is now sending it to enlighten the nations, turning them from the worship of idols. Marti and Budde think that the two passages describe Israel's mission to the Gentiles. Marti says that vv. 5—9 contain Yahweh's declaration of His intention to fulfil in the near future the predictions of the preceding Servant Song.[18] Budde maintains that 1—4 and 5—9 correspond to each other in that 1—4 gives us Yahweh's monologue about the servant-Israel and his high task, while 5—9 contains the message from Yahweh to Israel concerning its mission to the world.[19] Buhl regards the affinity between the two pieces as so close that he takes them together as a separate unit labelled as the first Ebed Yahweh Song.[20] Finally, according to J. Fischer the first Servant Song comprises XLII.1—7.[21] In general the commentators have observed the similarity of the section XLII.5—9 to the first Song, but the closer relation between the two poems has been expressed in very different ways.[22] It is in reality impossible to separate the subject

[17] *The Suffering Servant*, pp. 131ff., and in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Pres. to Robinson*, p. 112.

[18] *Das Buch Jesaja*, Tübingen 1900.

[19] In *Die heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments, übersetzt von E. Kautzsch*, 4. Aufl., herausgeg. von A. Bertholet, 1. Bd., Tübingen 1922.

[20] *Jesaja oversat og fortolket*, 2. Udg., Köbenhavn and Kristiania 1912.

[21] *Isaias 40—55 und die Perikopen vom Gottesknecht*, Münster i. W. 1916, pp. 83ff.

[22] A few scholars indeed are of the opposite opinion, namely that the passage 5—9 has nothing at all to do with the preceding Song, but is to be understood as an oracle about Cyrus. So particularly M. Haller in *Eucharisterion* presented to H. Gunkel, Göttingen 1923, 1, pp. 261—277, Mowinckel in *ZAW*, 1931, pp. 92—96, and van der Ploeg, *op. cit.*, pp. 28ff. It may be admitted that much of that which is said in vv. 6—7 of the one who is called is said in other passages of Cyrus. But the expressions used are so general that they may well be applied to others who serve Yahweh. The contradiction which Mowinckel finds between the picture of the 'servant' in the Song and the figure delineated in 5—9 exists only if the expressions of v. 7b are interpreted in a literal sense. The expression 'open blind eyes' proves however that we here have to deal with metaphors (so recently M. Buber, *The Prophetic Faith*, New York 1949, p. 216). 'The former things' and 'the new things' cannot refer to different stages of the activity of Cyrus. 'The new things' are always in Deutero-Isaiah something absolutely new, as will be evident from the following. The expressions לאור גוים and לברית עם (according to my

matter of the two passages, but to my mind the variety of the interpretations offered by commentators proves that the right way of solving the problem has not yet been found. I shall in the sequel try to adopt a new approach, but before I present my own solution, it is necessary to examine the text of the second passage in detail.

With respect to form the passage is an oracle introduced by the usual oracle formula. The oracle commences with some sentences in hymnic style. Then follows a solemn declaration by Yahweh to someone who is addressed in the second person: 'I Yahweh called thee in righteousness'. Yahweh declares that He will hold the hand of 'the called' and preserve him[23], and so enable him to perform a high task. The first indication of the nature of this task is given by the much debated words לברית עם. It is not difficult to see that the interpretation of these words has usually been determined by the interpreter's opinion concerning the problematic subject spoken about in this passage. It is preferable to attempt to explain the words without reference to that special problem. Professor North has given us a list of renderings proposed. Many other possibilities are mentioned in the works of Buhl, Bentzen, Pedersen etc. Another rendering of the word ברית has recently been proposed in the new *Lexicon in veteris testamenti libros*[24]: 'blood brotherhood.' I think עם must be taken in a general sense. If the author had meant the nation of Israel, he would surely have written העם, or something else unmistakably pointing to Israel. The asyndetical juxtaposition of לברית עם and לאור גוים proves, it seems to me, that the general meaning of the two words עם and גוים is the same. Then ברית עם must signify a 'covenant' or else an 'alliance' or a 'confederation of peoples' (the meaning passing from a more abstract to a more concrete sense), and the whole phrase is to be translated: 'I will make you a confederation of peoples'. 'The called' will grow into a large assembly of peoples bound together, of course, by the same faith and a common subjection to Yahweh, Israel's God. The correctness of this interpretation will become fully evident in the sequel when this passage is brought into connection with analogous passages in Deutero-

---

explanation) are not appropriate as a description of the achievements of Cyrus. In the Cyrus oracles proper the Persian king is described as a tyrant and destroyer of the foreign nations, the figure of XLII. 5—9 is thought of as a benefactor and saviour of the nations.

[23] This is the correct translation of ואצרך (not 'form', 'fashion'), as will be seen in the following. The 'preserving' activity of Yahweh plays an important rôle in Deutero-Isaiah.

[24] *Edidit* Ludwig Koehler, Leiden 1948ff.

Isaiah.[25] According to LI.4 and some other passages in Deutero-Isaiah אור must be rendered 'welfare', 'salvation'. It is said that 'the called' will mediate welfare and salvation to the pagan nations. In consequence, blind eyes will be opened and prisoners released, symbolic expressions for the fundamental religious change to happen in the pagan world. This spiritual revolution in the pagan world is what in v. 9 is characterized as 'new things' proclaimed by Yahweh.

Who is 'the called', designed by Yahweh to be founder and centre of a Yahweh-federation in the world and a medium of salvation to the heathen? Fortunately the last word of the oracle gives us a satisfactory answer, namely אתכם.[26] Here the plural form is substituted for the singular form of v. 6. Obviously 'the called' is a community that can be addressed now in the singular, now in the plural form. This community cannot be anything but Israel. Israel is called by Yahweh; Israel is to be held by the hand and preserved by Yahweh; Israel is destined to be founder and centre of a large Yahweh-federation in the world and to mediate salvation to the heathen. By means of Israel's witness the pagan world will gain the true religion and become subject to Yahweh, the only real God. These wonderful events are now foretold by Yahweh as 'new things', and the importance of these new things accounts quite satisfactorily for the solemn phrases which introduce the oracle.

---

[25] This explanation comes, in substance, very near that of M. Buber in his last book, *The Prophetic Faith*. Buber says on p. 225: the servant is called to link the nations together to be an international people of God. — Against the suggestion made by H. Torczyner (*Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 16, 1936, pp. 1—8) 'splendour of the people', according to the Akkadian *barārû*, 'shine', it may be objected that it is unlikely that this unusual sense of a common word would have been readily understood by the original hearers or readers of the prophecy. — H. H. Rowley, *The Missionary Message of the Old Testament*, p. 51, translates: 'made thee a covenant of humanity': God designs that Israel in active worship shall share the faith which is her glory with all men. Cf. G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, 1, 1933, p. 34, n. 73: 'Menschheitsbund'. R. Levy, *Deutero-Isaiah*, Oxford 1925: 'covenant to mankind'. But in *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament* Rowley translates 'covenant of the people' (p. 137). Similarly in *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, London 1950, p. 63.

[26] This significant word is often overlooked by the commentators. To others it offers a problem. The remark made by Duhm in his Commentary is very instructive: those who are meant are the readers of 'this writing' not the deities and their worshippers, about whom he had just spoken contemptuously in the third person (XLI. 28—29, XLII. 8). Arguments like that become quite unnecessary once the identity of the persons addressed in vv. 6—7 and v. 9 is realized. By indicating their identity, the word in question provides a clue to the problem of the oracle as a whole.

Thus we have in Isa. XLII.1—9 two sections intimately related to each other, but characteristically different in certain respects. In the first section Yahweh presents His servant to the prophet. The servant is a vassal-king, chosen by Yahweh, who holds him by the hand and endows him with the spirit for carrying out his task in Yahweh's service, i. e., to proclaim and establish the divine *tôrâh* in the earth. In the second section the people of Israel are addressed. They are called and supported by Yahweh that they may perform a sublime mission, the aim of which is the submission of the pagan nations to Yahweh and their salvation.

The parallelism between the two pieces is manifest. But what is the literary relation between them? My answer is: *they stand to each other as an allegory to its interpretation.* The Ebed-Yahweh poem is an *allegorical picture*, set forth in the form of a divine, visionary revelation to the prophet; the following piece, vv. 5—9, contains the interpretation or application of the allegorical picture.

The oracle formula כה אמר יהוה with which the second section begins serves here to introduce not a quite new oracle, but the interpretation of a preceding symbolic picture. This use of the formula is very common in the Old Testament, as will be shown in chapter IV of this study. For Deutero-Isaiah I can e.g. refer to XLV.9ff., where the parables of the clay and the potter and of the child and its parents likewise are followed by an interpretation which begins with the formula in question, and to XLIX.24—25, where the parable of the spoil and the hero is interpreted by some sentences introduced by the same formula.

As we have seen, the chief points of the allegorical picture have their exact equivalents in the interpretation. Such a correspondence belongs to the rules of allegorical exposition. It is, however, not necessary that every feature of the allegorical picture should have its equivalent in the interpretation. Various details may have been inserted there only in order to render the imaginative narrative more vivid and picturesque. Here, in the Servant Song, an important detail is found which has no direct equivalent at all in the interpretative passage, viz. the description of the fashion in which the servant performs his charge: 'he shall not cry nor make any clamour' etc. This detail is missing in the following passage. But what is missing in the text is not missing in reality. Israel, through whom salvation is to come to the heathen, has not at its disposal forcible and violent means. Its actual situation constrains it to perform its work in a manner coresponding to the description of the servant-king of the allegorical picture.

In the picture of the servant, Israel will recognize itself. It will become aware of the sublime task entrusted to it by its God, and it will under-

stand that it must carry out its work not through forcible expedients but by spiritual means.

The prophetic allegory and its interpretation taken together form a unit which I call an *allegorical oracle*. In this case the allegorical oracle comprises the whole piece XLII.1—9. This passage was originally a unit, and should not be divided into two independent sections as is usually done. When the question about the composition of this section of Deutero-Isaiah is raised, the whole passage XLII.1—9 must be dealt with, and not the Servant Song as one unit and verses 5—9 as another. If this is done, it will immediately become evident that there is no break in the context in this part of the book.

What connects the allegorical oracle XLII.1—9 with the preceding section XLI.21—29 is this thought: the inability of the pagan gods to foretell the important events of history. The chief theme of the preceding passage is expressed in these sentences: 'Declare the things to come! Tell us what shall ensue hereafter! Who told from the beginning the appearance of Cyrus? Nay, there was none that announced it.' And the allegorical oracle ends with this declaration by Yahweh: 'I am Yahweh; that is my name; and my glory I will not give to another, nor mine honour to graven images. The former things, behold, they came to pass, and new things I now declare; before they spring forth I inform you.' Obviously there is a very close connection between XLII.1—9 and that which precedes.

The song of praise in XLII.10—12, which follows immediately after the allegorical oracle, is a very appropriate sequel to the declaration about the sublime task entrusted to Israel. Israel is to be the light of the Gentiles, and by means of Israel the pagan nations will be converted to Yahweh and share in the true religion. These are the 'new things' which have not yet happened but are now to come. Because of this prospect the nations are called upon to glorify Yahweh: 'Sing to Yahweh a new song, His praise from the end of the earth.'

If I am right in maintaining that the first Servant Song contains an allegorical picture and that the servant himself is an allegorical figure, an important step has been taken towards a better understanding of the Ebed Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah. Is it possible to interpret the other Ebed-Yahweh Songs in the same way?

2. Second Song: XLIX. 1—6.

Nobody familiar with the different literary categories in the prophetic literature can fail to see in this passage a prophetic confession. And

nobody would have been in doubt that Deutero-Isaiah himself speaks in this confession, but for the assumption that the servant must be the same in all the Servant Songs. The figure of XLIX.1—6 has in reality little to do with the figure of the first Servant Song. There the servant appears as Yahweh's vassal-king entrusted with regal functions; here we hear a prophet speaking about his own experiences, his calling, the crisis in his prophetic life, and about a new task given him by his God.

The second Servant Song may be classed with a number of passages in the prophetic literature where a prophet speaks of himself in the first person, describing how he has been called, appointed and endowed for a high task, how in a spiritual crisis he has fought with his God and been consoled and strengthened by God. Such prophetic confessions we find e.g. in Isa. VI and LXI; Jer. I, XV, XVII, XX, and Ez. I—III. Like Jeremiah, the servant of Isa. XLIX knows that he has been called from his mother's womb. From his birth he was designed to be Yahweh's servant to fulfil a divine charge. He was appointed to be an instrument in Yahweh's hand, a sword, an arrow, reserved and guarded for the moment when it would be used. Jeremiah likewise must be in readiness until he got the order: 'Gird up thy loins and arise and speak unto them' (Jer. I.17). Isaiah's mouth had to be purified before he could speak Yahweh's word. Yahweh put His words in Jeremiah's mouth. Likewise the servant of Isa. XLIX confesses, 'He made my mouth like a sharp sword.' The divine word was to the servant a sword and an arrow (effective instruments) just as Jeremiah by means of the divine word had power to root out and to pull down, to destroy and to throw down, to build and to plant. Jeremiah and Ezekiel felt appalled in the face of the immense work, and trembled when considering the resistance they would meet with. Jeremiah felt tempted to give up. He said, 'I will not make mention of Him, nor speak any more in His name' (XX.9). The servant of the second Song tells us how there came a crisis in his prophetic life: he had toiled in vain; he had spent his strength for nought and vanity. But like Jeremiah he trusted in the support of the Lord: his cause was with Yahweh, his recompense with his God, and his God became his strength.

So much for the literary category of the second Servant Song: it is a prophetic confession describing the experiences of the nameless prophet himself.

The introductory sentences are significant: 'Hearken, ye far coasts, unto me, and give attention, ye distant peoples!' I shall return to them later on. When it is said that the prophet, whose mouth is likened to a sword, and who is made by Yahweh like an arrow, was hidden in the

shadow of His hand (DSIa has 'His hands') and concealed in His quiver (DSIa has באשפתיו), this signifies that for a certain period the prophet was kept in quiet readiness until the appropriate time came. That was the first act of the drama of Deutero-Isaiah's prophetic life.

The symbols of the sharp sword and the polished arrow have been chosen to indicate, as Volz in particular emphasizes, that for a certain time the prophet's task was to rebuke and condemn.[27] Since v. 6 refers to activity among the Jews previous to a period of work among the pagan nations, we must assume that the prophet here looks back to a time when he condemned and denounced his own people, an important factor which ought to be kept in mind. That was the second act of the drama.

But in the life of the prophet a moment came when it seemed to him as if he had failed in his mission to Israel, viz. to compel the people to repent and thus save it from religious apostasy and political destruction (v. 5—6). Religious and political renewal could not be separated in ancient Israel. In this critical moment the prophet received a new revelation from Yahweh: he was told that he had been set apart to be a light to the nations, that is to say: he was to perform a missionary task in order that the Gentiles might be saved. The future of Israel is for the moment left out of consideration, the chief stress being laid on the new task in relation to the Gentiles. Here the final act commences.

I can see no reason for altering the text in v. 5. The words ואכבד בעיני יהוה etc. form a parenthesis in preparation for the revelation in v. 6 with its sublime declaration from God. Such parentheses are typical of the style of Deutero-Isaiah. The honour conferred on the prophet by Yahweh consists precisely in the fact that he has been entrusted with such a high task as to be instrument for the salvation of the heathen.[28]

---

[27] That terms analogous to these symbols can on occasion be used of kings (Engnell, *op. cit.*, p. 69) does of course not exclude the possibility that the symbols in question are here combined with the activity of a prophet.

[28] I hold that there is no ground for changing לֹא in v. 5 into לוֹ, as is done by many critics. The ideas 'not perish', 'be preserved' have great significance in the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah during a certain period, as will be seen below (pp. 52 ff.). For נצירי v. 6 Driver reads נצרי: the shoots of Israel, *Die Welt des Orients*, 1948, p. 236. 'The preserved' fits, however, very well into the thought-world of the Second Isaiah. — I prefer the punctuation וָאכבד to "וְא because the prophet describes something which has happened (cf. היה and the context; so e.g. Torrey). No other alteration in the text is necessary. ויאמר v. 6 emphasizes the import of the following oracle, and is, moreover, occasioned by the parenthesis in the foregoing line. Metrically it stands outside the line, cf. Torrey *ad loc.* — In v. 5 DSIa has erroneously יוצרך. In v. 5 (end) the same manuscript has (like Targ.) עזרי; this is possible but not certain. In v. 6 there is a transposition of the words 'Israel' and 'Jacob'.

To the word 'Israel' in v. 3 I shall return after having treated the whole passage 1—7.

This confession from the mouth of Deutero-Isaiah allows us to get an idea of the development of his experience as a prophet. That he felt called to preach the Yahweh religion to the heathen also, immediately after having proved a failure in his mission to Israel, is by no means incredible. As has often been pointed out, the situation of the prophet was the same as that of the Apostles in the Acts: the resistance of the Jews compelled the Apostles to turn to the Gentiles.[29]

After the Servant Song vv. 1—6 a little poem follows in v. 7, introduced by the common oracle formula and separated from the following section by the same formula repeated again in v. 8. It is not surprising that this poem, short as it is, has caused the commentators great difficulties.

Several scholars combine it with the following section[30]. Gressmann regards it as a special Servant Song ('das vierte Lied').[31] Kissane joins the verse with the preceding verses, by this means getting a coherent Servant Song. Fischer is of the opinion that verses 7—9a belong to the preceding Song as a kind of addition to it made by the author of the Ebed Songs.[32] Staerk regards v. 7 as a 'Begleitwort' attached to the Song and referring to Israel, the afflicted people.[33] Elliger ascribes the verse in part to Trito-Isaiah.[34] North's view is rather complicated. He says that it is tempting to suppose that the whole of v. 7, apart from the introductory formula, and in v. 8 the introductory formula and bα, are later insertions in an Israel-Song. He thinks that v. 7 in any case is only a fragment, together with 8 bα pointing to a very early 'individual' interpretation of the person of the Servant.[35]

---

[29] In accordance with his theory of the nationalistic character of the Second Isaiah, Snaith interprets this Song in a quite original way. He paraphrases: 'It is far too small a thing to bring back only all the Babylonian exiles (the tribes of Jacob and the preserved of Israel). The servant's mission is to be »a light of Gentiles», i.e., a light throughout all the Gentile lands »that my salvation may be to the end of the earth», i.e., my salvation of Israel, since this is the only salvation in which the prophet is interested. The servant will be a light to guide every Israelite wanderer home.' *Op. cit.*, p. 198. I hope that it will be evident from the following chapter that Snaith's 'nationalistic theory' is untenable.

[30] For example Duhm, Köhler, Budde, Volz, Mowinckel.

[31] *Op. cit.*, p. 299. Begrich regards v. 7 as an independent oracle belonging to a period after that of XLIX. 1—6; *op. cit.*, p. 140f.

[32] *Op. cit.*, p. 107.

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 117.

[34] *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja*, Stuttgart 1933, pp. 43ff., 51.

[35] *Op. cit.*, pp. 128ff.

I have related these various theories in order to demonstrate the confused state of exegesis on this point.

To my mind the problem can be solved in the most natural way if my theory of the allegorical picture and its interpretation is also applied to this section of the Deutero-Isaianic text.

The chief points of the little poem are the following.

Yahweh is called 'the redeemer of Israel' (DSIa reads גואלכה indicating that Israel is addressed) and his 'Holy One', stress being laid on the fact of the election of Israel.

The person addressed is introduced by the expressions לבזה נפש, למתעב גוי and למשלים לעבד. Kissane vocalizes לְבֹזֵה נ׳ and translates 'self-contemned'. G. R. Driver rightly supplies, in this reflexive construction, a suffix, reading נפשו.[36] So also LXX: τὸν φαυλίζοντα τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ. Snaith translates: 'to him that despised life (self), abhorred of the heathen, slave of rulers'.[37] I prefer to translate the consonants of the massoretic text: 'who despises his life'. That is precisely what Job did when he said, 'I do not care for my soul, I despise my life' (IX.21).[38] It is however to be observed that DSIa has לבזוי, which has often been suggested as the right reading. Then the translation must be: 'to him who is held cheap with regard to his life'. It is difficult to choose between the two readings. The second word must be read לְמֻתָּעָב (part. Pu'al, DSIa has wrongly למתעבי). The person addressed is thus described as one who despises his life, or whose life is held cheap, who is abhorred by people and a slave of tyrant rulers.

But something will happen which will completely change the situation: 'Kings will see it and arise, and princes, and they will bow down.' Yahweh will perform a wonderful act, through which He will demonstrate His faithfulness towards His chosen people.

There can be no doubt that the subject addressed in this poem and introduced in the last word of the poem by 'you' is Israel. The election of Israel is strongly emphasized both at the beginning and at the end. The situation described in the second line of v. 7 corresponds exactly to the condition of Israel in the exile: it was indeed despising its own life, or despised by others, it was abhorred by the surrounding population and enslaved by cruel foreign rulers. We are not told wherein the expected

---

[36] *JTS*, 36, 1935, p. 401.

[37] *Op. cit.*, p. 198f.

[38] לא אדע נפשי אמאס חיי. It may be observed that נפשי and חיי stand as synonyms. Similarly we find ירא לנפש, חרד לנ׳, be afraid for one's life, tremble for one's life (Josh. IX. 24; Ez. XXXII. 10). יקרה נפש signifies: someone's life is precious (1 Sam. XXVI. 21). Cf. J. Lindblom, *ZAW*, 63, 1951.

deed of Yahweh will consist. It may be the deliverance of the captives, or it may be the conversion of the heathen to Yahweh by means of Israel (cf. XLII.6f.). The mysterious tone which characterizes the intimation of the great wonder awaited decidedly favours the second alternative.[39]

Combined with the preceding Song this little poem is adequately explained as containing the application to Israel of what has been said about the personal experiences of the prophet in the Song. The oracle formula serves here in v. 7, as in XLII.5, to introduce the interpretation or the application of the allegorical picture.

Even a rapid glance at the text shows that the chief points of the Song correspond very closely to the chief points of the application: the calling, the despondency, the encouraging, and the new charge. Thus the demands are fulfilled which must be taken into consideration in a text where an allegorical picture is combined with its application.

In XLII. 1—4 the Servant Song was a product of imagination; here, XLIX.1—6, the Song contains an account of historical facts, i.e. of real experiences in the life of the prophet. Is it permissible to describe an account of actual facts as an allegory? The allegorical character of a story does not depend on the alternative: historical description or fiction; it depends on its aim. The term allegory may be applied either to a narrative which is historical in the strict sense, or to one which is purely the product of the imagination, provided that the narrator's purpose is to illustrate or explain some other situation in real life. The story of the marriage of Hosea is an allegorical narrative, told in order to illustrate the relation between Yahweh and Israel, irrespective of whether it is a true account of historical facts, or, as many think, a purely imaginary tale.

Like XLII.1—9 the section XLIX.1—7 must be dealt with as one, coherent oracle from beginning to end. If this is done, two peculiarities in the Servant Song are seen in a new light. Firstly the introductory summons to the coasts and the distant peoples to hearken and give attention to what the prophet has to say. Such an appeal is very natural in a declaration by Yahweh (cf. Isa. I.2, XLI.1 etc.), but less natural in the confession of the personal experiences of a human being. If the whole of mankind had been called upon *only* to attend to the prophet's confession, it would be difficult to understand for what reason such a

[39] Mowinckel, *op. cit.*, p. 105, maintains that we want to hear what the kings are going to see and why they are going to arise. It is perhaps true that *we* want this information; but it is not equally true of the first hearers or readers. They were, no doubt, very well initiated into the thoughts of the prophet at that time, and did not need any detailed expositions. — In v. 7 DSIa has ראו and והשתחוו.

world-wide audience had been demanded. If the introductory phrases belong to the whole passage 1—7, the matter becomes quite clear: the nations are called upon to hear about Israel's mission to the world and the salvation in which the whole human race is intended to share. This prospect may well claim the attention of even the distant nations.

The second problem refers to the much discussed word 'Israel' in v. 3. From a metrical point of view nothing certain can be said about the genuineness of the word.[40] In accordance with my interpretation of the Servant oracle 1—7, the word 'Israel' can be very well justified if we translate the line in the following way: 'And he said to me: You, my servant, you are (i.e. symbolize) Israel, and through you I shall be glorified.' In this divine declaration to the prophet it would thus be directly indicated that the confession of the prophet serves as an allegorical picture referring to the people of Israel.[41] If this explanation is unacceptable, the only satisfactory alternative is to delete the word as an interpolation from the hand of somebody who regarded the Servant Song as dealing directly with the people of Israel and its historical experiences.[42]

---

[40] The metre in this Song varies greatly. The line of v. 3 can be scanned in different ways. ויאמר לי can be regarded as integral to the metre, or as falling outside the metre. לי can be taken as an independent word, or be connected enclitically with ויאמר. That 'Israel' is missing in one manuscript is interesting, but not decisive. That can be explained in different ways. DSIa has the word.

[41] In all the main features of the Song the prophet himself stands as a symbol of Israel, but here especially as one through whom Yahweh will be *glorified*. In many other passages it is said, in fact, that Yahweh will get Himself glory by Israel (XLIV.23 בישׂראל יתפאר). Grammatically there is of course no objection to explaining 'you are Israel' as signifying 'you are a symbol of Israel'. Compare τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ σῶμά μου and τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ αἷμά μου in the words of institution. The Hebrew had no other means of expressing such a thought. — The dialogue, vv. 3—6, introduces the final act of the prophetic career of the Second Isaiah. In v. 5 there is the impressive declaration that Yahweh had called the prophet *even from the womb* to be his servant. Thus it seems to be very natural to understand עבדי in v. 3 as a vocative. The new call indicated in v. 3 evokes the objection from the side of the prophet with which we are confronted in v. 4a. — It may be noticed that E. Burrows, *The Gospel of the Infancy and other Biblical Essays*, London [1940], pp. 59—80, identifying the servant with the house of David, translates: 'Thou art ... Israel, thou in whom I will glorify myself '(the name being regarded as predicate).

[42] So usually scholars who explain the second Song as dealing with an individual. That there was in fact a tendency towards inserting 'Israel' in the Servant Songs is evident from the LXX in XLII.1, as has often been pointed out. — One of the latest defenders of 'Israel' in v. 3 is J. A. Bewer in *Festschrift A. Bertholet ... gewidmet*, Tübingen 1950, p. 67f. Bewer identifies the Ebed of this Song with Israel, and removes the difficulties of vv. 5—6 by means of an interpretation

When combining vv. 1—6 and v. 7 into one coherent passage we gain, moreover, the advantage that the connection with the preceding and the subsequent sections becomes quite natural and clear. The section that begins in v. 8 ends with v. 21. The oracle formula in v. 22 indicates that here a new section begins. Many scholars, e.g. Duhm, Budde, Gressmann, Mowinckel, and Kissane, are of the opinion that a new section begins in v. 14. But the opening words indicate that there is a close connection between vv. 14ff. and the preceding passage. The section 8—21, taken as a whole, gives us a very distinct line of thought: Yahweh promises to deliver His people from Babylonia. The exiles will return to their own country from all quarters of the earth. But Zion does not trust in the good will and the power of Yahweh. Because of her distress she believes that Yahweh has forgotten and forsaken His people. Yahweh attempts to encourage the despondent and despairing people through the parable of the mother who cannot forget her child. The return of the exiles is close at hand. They are already on the road.

The theme common to those passages, 1—7 and 8—21, is the antithesis of despondency and promise. The servant-prophet-Israel in 1—7 is filled with discouragement when he sees that he has failed. Yahweh encourages him, and a glorious new prospect is set before him. In XLIX.8ff. the coming return of the exiles is described, then the despondency of Zion, and finally how Zion is to be given yet greater glory.

The connection with the preceding section XLVIII.20—21 is also clear. That passage likewise contains a description of the redemption and glorifying of Israel: the captives will be released, and they will return home. The words: 'Announce this; make it go forth to the end of the earth', correspond to the thought of XLIX.7: 'Kings shall see, and they

---

which is grammatically possible, but, as it seems to me, somewhat forced. According to Bewer Yahweh is the logical subject of לְשׁוֹבֵב. A. Lods, *Les prophètes d' Israël et les débuts du judaïsme*, Paris 1935, p. 277, n. 6, thinks likewise that Yahweh is the subject in the second line of v. 5. He translates: 'Et maintenant Yahvé qui m'a formé dès le sein de ma mère, a dit — c'est-à- dire a décidé, a promis — de ramener Jacob'. And v. 6: 'C'est trop peu de chose pour moi de relever les tribus de Jacob etc.' Earlier Budde had taken Yahweh as subject in v. 5, second line, and v. 6, first line. Similarly J. M. P. Smith and W. A. Irwin, *The Prophets and their Times*, Chicago 1947, p. 230. In the *Bertholet-Festschrift* de Liagre-Böhl in an article 'Missions-und Erwählungsgedanke in Alt-Israel' likewise identities the servant with Israel and explains v. 5f. in this way: 'Hiermit müssen die abgeirrten zehn Stämme der ersten Verbannung gemeint sein', p. 92. Similarly already W. Rudolph, 'Der exilische Messias', *ZAW*, 43, 1925, pp. 90—114. But is such a distinction thinkable in Deutero-Isaiah? Cf. G. A. Danell, *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*, Uppsala 1946, pp. 261—263.

shall rise up; and princes, and they shall bow down, because of Yahweh who has been faithful, the Holy One of Israel, who has chosen you.'

The Servant Song taken as an independent passage has no connection at all with the context, a fact which has caused much trouble to commentators; but combined with the following verse it forms a closely coherent oracle very suitable in the place where the compiler has inserted it. This observation strengthens my contention that XLIX.1—7 forms a literary unit composed of an allegorical picture and its application.

3. Third Song: L. 4—9.

Most scholars agree in limiting the third Servant Song to verses 4—9.[43] If we discard the assumption that the subject of all the Servant Songs must be the same, we are at liberty to interpret the figure of this Song irrespective of the interpretation of the other Songs. A cursory examination shows that the Song belongs to the same category as XLIX.1—6. It is a prophetic confession. There is no ground for doubting that the speaker is Deutero-Isaiah himself. He describes how he receives revelations from Yahweh, how he has bravely announced them, and how he has been scoffed at and persecuted by antagonists and enemies. But Yahweh helps him; he knows that he will not be put to shame; His vindicator is near. He has nothing to fear from his adversaries. They will all fail in their undertaking, and pay the penalty for their wickedness.

The leading ideas of this passage are quite clear; but some details of interpretation are uncertain. In the second line דבר seems to be the

[43] There are exceptions, of course. Kissane defends the unity of the whole poem 4—11. According to Staerk and Gressmann, the passage 4—10 is a coherent unit because of the homogeneity of the contents. Bentzen likewise takes 4—11 as a literary unit, 10—11 being an oracle containing an answer to the preceding 'prayer of complaint' (*op. cit.*, p. 89). Bentzen is right in taking 4—9 and 10—11 together as a unit; but I cannot regard 10—11 as an oracle-answer. The preceding passage is not a prayer, and 10—11 is not an answer at all. These latter verses are not addressed to the person who utters the lament of 4—9, but partly to those that fear Yahweh, partly to those that kindle a fire. Begrich, too, regards vv. 4—9 as 'Klagelied', but emphasizes that every trace of prayer is missing. He does not see in 10—11 an answer, but reckons the verses, quite arbitrarily, as unauthentic (*op. cit.*, pp. 5 and 48). Engnell is right in maintaining that the speaker in 10—11b is the same as in 4—9, and that 11c contains an oracle from Yahweh including a divine promise concerning the annihilation of the enemies. As is to be expected, he sees in the speaker of 4—11b 'the Ebed-King' depicted in conformity to the 'Tammuz-ideology' (*op. cit.*, pp. 70ff.). I cannot, however, discern anywhere in the passage a single feature which would not be equally appropriate as a description of a prophet-martyr, namely Deutero-Isaiah himself.

object of the verb לדעת and לעות את־יעף to indicate the aim of the endowment of the prophet. What עות signifies, is quite uncertain. The translations of Aquila, ὑποστηρίσαι, and Jerome, *sustentare*, are very suitable in the context.[44] I think that the correct translation ought to be something like this:

The Lord Yahweh has given me a disciple's tongue
to know the right word to support the weary.
Every morning[45] he wakens my ear to hear like disciples.

The first יעיר seems to be an erroneous doublet.

The following section comprises verses 10—11. The prophet still continues to speak. He addresses among his auditors a special group of people, whom he characterizes as fearing Yahweh and listening to the voice of His servant, viz. the prophet himself. When walking in darkness, that is to say, when in distress, they ought to trust in the name of Yahweh and lean upon their God. After this the prophet turns to the enemies of those who fear Yahweh and listen to the prophet: they will all together perish in the fire they have kindled; and they will lie down in torments. This threat is later confirmed by Yahweh himself.[46]

Those who fear Yahweh and listen to the prophet are of course the faithful among the exiles. Their enemies are the infidel Jews, the sceptics and the apostates.

From the point of view of its contents this second passage is of great importance as proving that a crisis had occurred among the exiles. They had split into two different groups: the faithful and the apostates. This passage thus makes it clear that we really have to reckon with a group which faithfully adhered to Yahweh, trusted in His promises, and gathered about the prophet as his true disciples, and, on the other side, with a group of sceptical and unbelieving people, who did not trust in Yahweh and turned away from the prophet, embittering the life of their loyal and faithful compatriots.

It is of a great interest to notice that this passage has caused considerable difficulty to those critics who have not connected it with the

[44] From other ancient versions we have not much help. The LXX has for לעות (regarded as לעת) ἐν καιρῷ ἡνίκα or only ἡνίκα. Also DSIa with its slight variations sheds no light on the difficulty. In what follows, this manuscript has למטלים for למרטים and הסירותי for הסתרתי See further J. Lindblom, *ZAW*, 63, 1951.

[45] So correctly T. K. Cheyne, *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, II, 5th ed., London 1889, Staerk, Volz, Kissane etc. The same construction is found in Zeph. III. 5.

[46] In v. 11 there are some rather obscure details. But the general sense is quite clear. See the Commentaries. — DSIa has in v. 10 יראו for ירא, הלכו for הלך, in v. 11 הנה for הן, כולם for כלכם.

preceding Song. Duhm regards vv. 10—11 as a very late addition made by the same redactor who, according to him, inserted the Ebed-Yahweh Songs into the Book of Deutero-Isaiah. Marti thinks that the verses form one of the latest elements in the book. Köhler declares summarily that v. 11 is not authentic, because it belongs to another sphere of thought, while v. 10 is »von fraglicher Echtheit». Volz says: verses 10—11 are most probably an addition made by one of those who compiled our present Book of Deutero-Isaiah. Sellin attributes the verses to Trito-Isaiah. Elliger ascribes v. 10 to Trito-Isaiah, v. 11 to a glossator.[47] Buhl is of the opinion that the author is someone who lived in later Judaism, at a time when there was bitter antagonism between the faithful and the apostate Jews. Gressmann reckons v. 10 as an integral part of the preceding section, but regards v. 11 as a secondary supplement, this verse presupposing the late idea of hell, and, moreover, being 'almost unintelligible'. Budde regards v. 10 as authentic, but takes v. 11 as an addition, because it pronounces the ruin of all who hear the preaching of the prophet. This is a quite arbitrary interpretation of the words. The reference here is of course not to all who hear the preaching of the prophet, but to all those who kindle a fire, that is, all the adversaries of the faithful Jews. In v. 11, according to Budde, a fanatic of a later time speaks, treating all pagans as one *massa perditionis*. North maintains that the verses have scarcely any literary affinity either with the Songs or with the main prophecy.

Various arguments have been set forth against the authenticity of verses 10—11. The split in the community of which the verses speak is, according to many critics, inconceivable until a much later time. The verses are interpreted as speaking of hell, and as having in general a harsher tone than is usual in Deutero-Isaiah. Finally, the prophet could not have spoken about himself in the third person.

As to the first objection, it is a quite arbitrary assumption that the cleavage between those who believed in Yahweh and were true followers of the prophet on the one side, and those who did not believe on the other side is inconceivable in the time of the captivity. Considering the extremely critical situation in which the exiles lived, grievously oppressed as they were by the world-power and deeply perturbed by the startling vicissitudes of history, it would really have been extraordinarily astonishing if the whole *gôlâh* had formed one, homogeneous body of genuine believers adhering to the prophet and his preaching. It is a well-known fact that already before the exile the prophets had to

---

[47] *Op. cit.*, pp. 33ff.

fight against people who refused to listen to their words and would not trust in the God of Israel. It is also a well-known fact that the exile in an increased degree broke the unity of the nation as a religious group, and promoted individualism in religion by placing the single members of the nation in a situation in which personal choice and decision became more urgent than ever before. Many more indications of such a split among the exiles will be set forth in a subsequent chapter, in which the thought of Deutero-Isaiah will be studied as a whole.

The second objection depends on a misunderstanding of the last line: 'In torment you shall lie down.' I cannot find a hint of hell in these words. The adversaries will be severely punished by Yahweh; and the punishment is described in a manner well-known in the Old Testament. Fire and burning and pains of different kinds are familiar instruments of divine punishment. The harsh metaphors in v. 11 are by no means astonishing in the mouth of a prophet who once likens Yahweh to a woman in travail, crying, gasping, and panting together (XLII.14).

That the prophet can characterize himself as Yahweh's servant is evident from the autobiographical confession in XLIX.1—6. That under certain circumstances a prophet can speak about himself in the third person is shown by Isa. XXI.12. Here, in our passage, עבדו stands in the second hemistich very appropriately corresponding to 'Yahweh' in the first hemistich: 'Whoever among you fears Yahweh and hearkens to the voice of His servant.' This is a very natural and self-evident manner of referring to oneself in Hebrew as in modern languages.

It is immediately obvious that verses 10—11 form a parallel in sense to the preceding Ebed-Yahweh Song, as has often been observed. In verses 4—9 the prophet is an obedient disciple of Yahweh, but bitterly persecuted because of his preaching. Trusting in Yahweh he endures, being persuaded that he will be justified. His adversaries will be punished without mercy. In verses 10—11 the group of believers among the people, who continue in the fear of Yahweh and hearken to the words of the prophet, are living in deep darkness, viz. in sore distress and oppression. They are persecuted by malignant enemies; and now the prophet exhorts them to trust in Yahweh and rely upon their God. The adversaries are all to be stricken by the most cruel punishment.

The parallelism in sense between verses 4—9 and verses 10—11 led Fischer to the conclusion that the servant of the former passage serves as an 'example of confidence' and that this is precisely what is expressed in v. 10.[48] This observation is correct; but considering the

[48] *Op. cit.*, p. 113. Fischer is, moreover, of the opinion that v. 10 (perhaps v. 11) comes from the 'redactor' of the Ebed-Yahweh passages. Kissane holds that Deutero-

result of the examination of the two foregoing Servant Songs, I should prefer to express the matter in this way: the narrative in verses 4—9 is an allegorical picture, the application of which follows in vv. 10—11. The allegorical picture, however, is here not of a fictitious nature, as was the case in XLII.1—4, but is autobiographical, like XLIX.1—6. Thus the sections L.4—9 and L.10—11 must on no account be separated one from another as is usually done. They are mutually dependent and inseparable. Together they form a single literary composition, the first part of which is an autobiographical symbolic narrative evidently based upon fact, the second part being the application of this symbolic narrative to the life and experiences of Israel during the exile.

And now we must examine how this composition, taken as a whole, is related to the context. The preceding section comprises L. 1—3. This passage begins with the common oracle formula, and is separated by it from what precedes. The main thought in L.1—3 is this: the reason for the misfortune of Israel is not that Yahweh has been obliged to abandon his people (there is no bill of divorcement, nor are any creditors to be found to whom Yahweh has sold his people as slaves); the sins and the apostasy of Israel are the cause of its condemnation. By that it is indicated that it is possible for the people to be rescued from their distress. But they have not listened to the words of promise and encouragement which Yahweh has spoken through the mouth of the prophet. Once more Yahweh brings to their memory that He is powerful enough to help, to redeem, and to perform mighty deeds.

This thought is certainly not unrelated to the main theme of the concluding passage of the composition L.4—11. The Prophet turns there to those who believe in his preaching, exhorting them to trust in Yahweh and rely upon their God. This passage deals, like the foregoing section, with despondency and distress on one side, and Yahweh's will and power to help on the other side. The concluding message of hope in L.4—11 corresponds very well to the encouraging message in L.1—3.

Still more evident is the connection with the subsequent section LI. 1—3. The prophet adresses here 'those who pursue righteousness' — this expression is similar to the phrase, 'whoever fears Yahweh' in v. 10; but it may be that the two expressions do not refer to exactly the same persons [49]— and he attempts to encourage them by pointing to all that God did with Sarah and with Abraham, Israel's ancestor. Once more

---

Isaiah himself is speaking in the whole piece 4—11. In the first part he finds 'a motive of confidence': 'the speaker's own example of fortitude and confidence'.

[49] In L. 10—11 one part only of the people is thought of; in LI.1 the expressions 'you that pursue righteousness, you that seek Yahweh' refer to Israel as a whole.

Yahweh is going to manifest His wonderful power by re-establishing the nation and the country of Israel.

This whole section of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah describes the struggle of Yahweh and His prophet for the soul of the chosen people, the struggle for the preservation of faith, the necessary condition for the deliverance of the people. The prophetic confession in L.4—9, which at first sight seems out of place in the context, fits well into it, if it is taken together with L.10—11, and, as has been done above, is regarded as an introduction, in the form of an allegorical picture, to the prophetic message to Israel in vv. 10—11.

4. Fourth Song: LII. 13—LIII. 12.

A very few critics, such as Schian, Laue and Staerk, have separated LII.13—15 (LIII.1) from the following passage maintaining that these verses did not originally belong to the subsequent poem, but formed an addition by the hand of the redactor who inserted the Ebed-Yahweh Songs into the Book of Deutero-Isaiah.[50] Some other scholars think that chapter LIII originally contained an independent song, used by the prophet as a basic element in his description of the suffering Servant.[51] I cannot approve of all the different reasons which have been advanced for a division of the traditional fourth Song into two different parts; but nevertheless I maintain that it is rather astonishing that most commentators have so lightly passed over the problem of the unity of the passage LII.13—LIII.12.

Even a rapid glance shows that verses LII.13—15 form a kind of parallel to what follows in LIII.2ff. In both cases a person is presented to us who after a period of the most extreme misery is going to be greatly exalted. In the former passage it is said that his appearance was so disfigured that he scarcely seemed human; in the later passage the hero is described as despised and forsaken of men, as one from whom men

[50] See North, *op. cit.*, pp. 48f., 65; Fischer, *op. cit.*, pp. 115ff. Of special interest is the theory of Staerk, *op. cit.*, pp. 116ff.: LII.13—15 did not originally form part of the following poem, but is an addition — Staerk calls it a 'Begleitwort' — intended to apply to Israel what is said of the martyr-king (Jehoiachin) in the Song. Staerk lays special stress upon the remarkable variation of speakers. The addition is made by the 'redactor' who inserted the older Ebed-Yahweh Songs into the Book of Deutero-Isaiah. I agree with Staerk that subject matter indicates a break between LII.13—15 and LIII; but apart from that my view differs from his. More recently the same division has also been suggested by Snaith, *The Expository Times*, 56, 1944—45, p. 81.

[51] See Fischer, *op. cit.*, pp. 118ff.

avert their gaze. In the former passage we hear that the 'servant' will succeed, he will be lifted up and greatly exalted; in the later passage we are told that the martyr in question will see (light) and be satisfied: as a victorious king he will gain a mighty spoil.

There are also significant differences. In the first passage the speaker is Yahweh, who tells us something about one whom He calls 'my servant'; throughout the greater part of the second passage a group speaks in the first person plural. At the end Yahweh is abruptly introduced and makes a declaration concerning His servant. The description in the first passage is short and summary; the later section contains much concrete and suggestive detail.

The similarities as well as the differences are of such a nature as to compel us to examine the relation between the two passages. Such an examination cannot be carried out without an exegetical discussion of them in detail, so far as the exceptionally obscure text permits us fully to penetrate into its meaning.

Beginning with LII.13 we note the fact that Yahweh, who is speaking here, first tells us something about someone whom He calls 'my servant'. The servant will succeed, be lifted up; he will be exalted and be exceedingly high.[52] In the following line, however, this servant is addressed in the second person: 'as many were appalled at you'. Most scholars substitute עליו for עליך, the alternation of 'he' and 'you' being, as it seems, unnatural, and from a stylistic point of view impossible. To my mind it is quite arbitrary to alter the text. Such a change between the second and the third person is typical of the prophetic style in general.[53] It is, furthermore, quite inconceivable that a copyist should have altered a clear and simple text in that manner.

The first line of v. 14, introduced by כאשר, continues with כן יזה in v. 15 a. The intervening clause, כן משחת ... אדם, must be regarded as a parenthesis, giving the reason for the fact that many were appalled at the appearance of the servant.

[52] Concerning the much discussed ישכיל I can fully accept the explanation offered by Kissane *ad loc.*: 'The translation "shall prosper" is too general; the verb means to carry out successfully a definite task.' This task, I hold, is Israel's mission to the pagan nations (see below). In performing this task Israel will succeed. For that reason it will then be highly exalted by Yahweh. Since my interpretation of the whole passage is quite different from that of e.g. H. S. Nyberg in his article 'Smärtornas man', *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 7, 1942, pp. 5—82, and Engnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 73ff., there is little point in my joining issue with them about the meaning of this particular word. — For the text of LII.13b see J. Hempel, *ZAW*, 55, 1937, p. 309f. DSIa has essentially the same text as the Massoretes.

[53] Cf. J. Lindblom, *Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur* (Uppsala universitets årsskrift, 1924), Uppsala 1924, pp. 22f. and 45f.

Leaving out the parenthetical line we get the following text (according to the metrical scheme 2:2).

כאשר שממו עליך רבים
כן יזה גוים רבים
עליו יקפצו מלכים פיהם

This may be translated:

As many were appalled at you,
so shall he ? many nations;
kings shall shut their mouth because of him.[54]

And further (15b):

For what has not been told them, they shall see;
and what they have not heard, they shall have to consider.

The following line, LIII.1, is vigorously debated. Who are the *we* who are speaking in this passage: 'Who would have believed that which *we* have heard?' North is in the main right in maintaining that the speakers are the Gentiles.[55] Torrey says explicitly that the speakers are the foreign princes and peoples of the preceding verse;[56] and Kissane points, furthermore, to the resemblance between the terms used in the two verses. In fact שמעתנו (LIII.1a) corresponds to שמעו (LII.15) as ראו (LII.15) is correlative to the phrase: 'The arm of Yahweh, over whom has it been revealed?' (LIII.1b). The questions in LIII.1 express the amazement of the kings, hearing and seeing what has happened to the servant of Yahweh, formerly an example of the most extreme misery, but now of triumph and exaltation. Elsewhere in Deutero-Isaiah other utterances like this are expressed without any introductory *verbum dicendi* (cf., with regard to the contents, e.g. XLV.14ff., where a similar utterance by the Gentiles occurs).

The sense of the clause וזרוע יהוה על מי נגלתה is not entirely clear. It is usually translated: 'unto whom was the arm of Yahweh revealed?' From a linguistic point of view this translation is of course passable (DSIa has in fact אל מי), but, as Kissane correctly remarks, there is no

[54] The comparison is here antithetic, the two members expressing opposite thoughts. For more examples of a similar kind in Deutero-Isaiah see below, p. 85. The antithesis is this: formerly, many were appalled at him, now, something will happen that will strike kings with amazement because of him.

[55] *Op. cit.*, p. 151; but North is wrong, it seems to me, in assuming the same subject in LIII.1 and LIII.2ff.

[56] So recently also A. Lods in his massive posthumous work, *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive*, Paris 1950, p. 478.

question of the making known of some truth by revelation, but of the manifestation of Yahweh's power. Thus the sentence is to be translated: 'The arm of Yahweh, upon whom was it revealed?' (North: 'over whom hath it been revealed?').[57] The wonderful and incredible fact is that through the power of Yahweh someone who was so miserable and despised became so highly exalted. Because of that the kings shut their mouths and then exclaimed, 'Who could have believed what we have heard?'

There remains in this passage a very obscure expression which has been the subject of much discussion: כן יזה גוים רבים. Everywhere in the Old Testament the stem נזה in Hiph. signifies 'sprinkle' (water, blood, oil). The person upon whom the liquid is sprinkled is not indicated by an accusative but by a preposition. For that reason all commentators either alter the text or assume another sense of the verb in question. A number of different proposals are registered in the commentaries and in BH. There is no need to recapitulate them here. In accordance with the LXX (θαυμάσονται) many assume an expression for amazement, either substituting a new word, or assuming an unknown sense of the verb, or basing the translation on the LXX without making an attempt to decide what may have stood in the original.

The learned Semitist, H. S. Nyberg, offers an original suggestion.[58] He takes גוים רבים as subject to יזה and translates the whole phrase in the following way: 'many peoples offer sacrifices of purifying (for his sake), and kings shut their mouths against him', i.e. they attempt to protect themselves from the infection spread by the servant of Yahweh, thought of as a leprous man.

None of the proposals offered is fully satisfactory. For instance, is it really probable that we have here the extremely rare construction where a verb in the singular is followed by a *personal* subject in the plural? The translation 'will be amazed' or the like is pure guesswork based on the presumed meaning of the context.

I think that the Massoretes regarded the verb יזה as a ritual *terminus technicus* in accordance with all the passages where it is employed in the Old Testament. I think, too, that they gave the word another sense than it usually has, and that they understood the phrase in this way: 'he (i.e. the servant) will besprinkle many peoples', that is to say: 'he will purify them from their sins'. It is a well-known fact that the Massoretes frequently employ peculiar constructions objectionable to us both from a lexical and from a syntactical point of view. It is moreover

---

[57] Nyberg translates the words in similar way.

[58] *Op. cit.*, p. 47f.

to be observed that ritual terms in particular vary greatly in their construction, e.g. the roots כפר, רצה and so on.

However, how the Massoretes understood the text is one thing, and what the original writer meant is another. Now, there existed in Hebrew another root closely cognate with נזה, namely יזה.[59] It is not preserved in the literature of the Old Testament, but forms part of two proper names: יזיאל, Ket. יזואל (1 Chron. XII.3) and יְזָנָה (Ezr. X.25). יזואל cannot signify anything but 'he who is besprinkled by God', i.e. he who is purified by God from sin, and יְזָנָה (Pi).: he whom Yahweh has purified from sin, the stem consequently having a transitive sense with personal objects.[60] If I am right in my interpretation of these names יְזָנֶּה in v. 15 is to be pointed יְזֶנֶּה or perhaps better יְזֶנֶּה, and the phrase should be translated: 'he (i.e. the servant) will (at some time in the future) besprinkle many peoples, i.e. purify many peoples from their sins.' I hold this to be the meaning of this obscure expression.

It is not possible to say what view of the verbal form is presupposed by the Syriac; but, in substance, its rendering is correct: 'he will purify (*m^{e}dakkê*) many peoples.'

It may be admitted that on my interpretation of the words כן יזה גוים רבים the correspondence between the two members of the comparison is not absolutely logical: 'as many (before) were appalled at you, so he (in the future) will purify many nations'. We have to reckon with a sort of anacoluthon, caused by the parenthetical clause inserted between the two comparative members.[61]

---

[59] It is a well-known fact that verbs פ"ן and פ"י are closely cognate. For instance, we find both נצב and יצב, both נקע and יקע. Similarly, I assume the form יזה, corresponding to נזה.

[60] M. Noth, *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1928, p. 245f., remarks on the name יזיה: 'das 1. Element Imperf. Kal von נזה=spritzen, sprengen im Sinne von reinigen, entsühnen?' But it is to be observed that the Qal-form of this stem everywhere in the Old Testament has an intransitive sense. At any rate the observation is valuable that the name in question is connected in some way or other with the stem 'sprinkle'. — In a letter to me Professor Noth writes with regard to Isa. LII.15 :'Mit einer übertragenen Bedeutung von נזה Hi. muss man durchaus rechnen. ... Die Massoreten haben an dieser Stelle gewiss an "besprengen" im übertragenen Sinne gedacht. Aber haben sie wirklich noch den ursprünglichen Konsonantentext vor sich gehabt?'

[61] Recently our passage is examined by Th. C. Vriezen in an article entitled 'The Term *Hizza*: Lustration and Consecration' in *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, VII, 1950, pp. 201—235. Vriezen is of the opinion that it is possible to explain the text from the main significance of the Hebrew word in Qal, 'splash', 'spatter'. According to Vriezen the sense of the first phrase of v. 15 is this: The 'Ebed will scatter

Thus the passage LII.13—LIII.1 contains a declaration by Yahweh concerning someone whom He calls His servant, and who in v. 14 is addressed in the second person. This servant of Yahweh is at present in a very miserable state: his appearance is so disfigured that he scarcely seems human, because of which many are appalled at him. But a great change is to take place in the immediate future. The servant will succeed; he will be lifted up, and greatly exalted. He will perform a wonderful work, making expiation for many nations and cleansing them from their sins. Witnessing this, kings will shut their mouths in amazement, for what has not been told them they will see, and what they have not heard they will have to consider. They will exclaim: 'Who could have believed that which we have heard? And the arm of Yahweh, upon whom has it been revealed?'

It cannot be denied that the line of thought in this section of text is quite clear and coherent. This supports the correctness of the interpretation given above.

It remains to ask who it is that Yahweh calls His servant and addresses in the second person in v. 14. Since the divine utterance must be thought of as made to a particular person or persons by the prophet, this 'you' cannot refer to anyone else than the prophet's hearers, namely the Jews, among whom the prophet worked and to whom he spoke. It seems to me most natural to understand the servant of Yahweh in this passage, as in many other passages in Deutero-Isaiah, as a term for Israel personified, particularly Israel in captivity. Israel is in a state of deepest misery and distress, and fills the surrounding nations with horror; but in the future it will be highly exalted. It is destined to be a means of purifying the Gentiles from sin; and when kings witness the unexpected success of Israel, they will stand there astonished by what they see and hear.

With LIII.2 a new section begins, the interpretation of which must now be considered.

I translate the first line in this way: 'Something like a sapling grew up before me, something like a root from an arid soil.'

---

many nations, he is said to make them retreat in great fear on all sides by his marvellous victory. The writer adds: 'We need not think here of a description of a defeat which the 'Ebed inflicts upon the nations, but it is the divine miracle shown in his unexpected victory, that terrifies the nations.' From a purely formal point of view Vriezen's suggestion can be accepted; but there is a substantial difficulty. As will subsequently be shown, the task of the servant in the Servant Songs is not to scatter and terrify the nations, but to mediate to them righteousness and salvation.

Many suggestions have been offered in explanation of the obscure לִפְנֵיו, which is to be found in DSIa, too. To my mind the most simple solution of the problem is to regard the following section as a prophetic revelation, reproduced by the prophet in the form of a vision, and to take as the correct reading לִפְנֵי, the letter *w* having arisen through doubling of the first letter of the next word וכשרש. The contents and the style of the whole passage from v. 2 to v. 12 are quite typical of a visionary narrative. Even the opening words have a vague and mysterious tone, similar, for instance, to the introduction of the vision in Isa. XXI: 'As whirlwinds in the south pass through, so it comes from the desert, from a terrible land' (cf. Jer. X.22, XLVIII.40, XLIX.22; Ez. VIII.2; Dan. VII.13). The sapling, or the root, is revealed in the sequel as the symbol of a human individual, suffering and in pain, who plays the leading part in the following poem. The expression 'sapling and root from an arid soil' (מארץ ציה belongs both to יונק and to שרש) indicates that the figure described in the following presents a miserable appearance, just as his milieu is poor and unfruitful.

The visionary narrative, commencing in v. 2, is developed, as frequently in stories of this nature, in different scenes. First scene (vv.2—6): Concrete description of the suffering man. He is afflicted by sickness and plagues. The sickness being of a disfiguring nature, his appearance is repulsive. He scarcely seems human. He is despised of men and like one from whom men avert their gaze. He seems to be stricken by God. Therefore men must despise him as one who is condemned by God and who pays the penalty of his sin. The suffering man is exactly in the same situation as Job, who was smitten with boils and appeared to be cursed by God. In this description a 'we' appears, introducing the spectators of the suffering man. They do not only describe his sufferings; they look upon them from a future point of view, when they have better understood the purpose of his suffering and realized what was the deepest reason for his affliction: 'It was our sufferings that he bore, our pains that he endured - - -. He was wounded by reason of our rebellions, crushed by reason of our sins.' The man's suffering is thus interpreted as vicarious suffering, as a penalty paid by him for the benefit of others: 'The chastisement leading to our welfare was upon him, and by means of his stripes there was healing for us.'[62]

Who are the speakers in this section? This problem has aroused much controversy. For details I must simply refer to the commentaries. There is no agreement among exegetes on this point. The problem in question is insoluble, as long as one asks: who is the suffering man? The answers

[62] DSIa has in v. 3 ויודע and ונבוזהו (for נבזה), in v. 5 ובחבורתיו.

to the question who the speakers are must be as varying as the answers to the question who the sick man is. The problem appears in a quite new light if the poem LIII.2ff. is interpreted as a prophetic revelation, as a vision in which the prophet sees with his inward eye what is described here. 'We' then denotes neither the Gentiles nor the Jews, but simply the bystanders in the vision, surrounding the sick man, witnesses of his plagues, who have come to understand the import of his suffering. In the vision the prophet includes himself among these bystanders, and speaks on behalf of them all.

Second scene, vv.7—9. The description of the sufferings of the sick man is here continued. The speakers of the preceding section have now retired. The prophet speaks alone. We hear how the sick man bears his suffering. He humbles himself and does not open his mouth. He is dumb like a sheep led to the slaughter. Finally the sickness ends with death; and his grave is made with the wicked, although he was himself righteous and innocent.[63] All this is related as something that has happened in the past. The impf. cons. in v. 9 may be observed. There are some obscure points in the text; but I think the prophet intended to describe the sick man as a leper (so B. Duhm, and among recent scholars H. S. Nyberg and M. Buber). The term נגע is typical of descriptions of leprosy. If that is the case, the expression מעצר וממשפט לקח can be explained in a very natural way: out from the (ritual) enclosure, out from the condemnation of God and men he was taken away. Death meant to him a release from his pitiable state as a leper. But his afflictions had not yet come to an end. He was buried among evil-doers, as was the custom with the unclean.[64]

[63] The meaning of v. 9 is substantially clear thanks to the perspicuity of the first hemistich of the first line and the whole second line. Of the second hemistich I am not able to give any certain explanation. The word עשיר, the rich, is very dubious. Nyberg is right in pointing to the fact that in the prophetic literature and the New Testament 'rich' is often synonymous with an evil man; but that the graves of the rich and the graves of the evil-doers could be synonymous is difficult to imagine; cf. Engnell, *op. cit.*, p. 86, n. 1. For 'rich' and 'poor' in the Old Testament see recently J. van der Ploeg, 'Les pauvres d' Israël et leur piété', *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, VII, 1950, pp. 236—270. DSIa has here another text: ועם עשירים בימתו. I think that the last word is the poetic plural of יום (cf. Deut. XXXII. 7 and Ps. XC.15), and means 'in his lifetime'. Perhaps the original text was: 'One put his grave among the wicked; earlier in his lifetime he had been among rich people.' See further my article in *ZAW*, 63, 1951, where other divergences in DSIa are noted.

[64] The best translation of דורו in v. 8 is 'his fate' or 'state'; cf. Driver, *JTS*, 36, 1935, p. 403 ('who doth consider his state?'; cf. Ps. XXIV.6); North, *op. cit.*, p. 125, Köhler, *Lexicon*, *sub voce*, and Nyberg, *op. cit.*, p. 53. Thus: 'Who pondered over his fate, that he was cut off from the land of the living?', etc. — For the last hemistich of v. 8 see below, p. 49.

Third scene, vv. 10—12: Yahweh appears, introduced by the prophet. The first hemistich recapitulates summarily the fate of the sick man: he was stricken by Yahweh. In the second hemistich and the following sentences Yahweh Himself speaks, declaring what will happen in the future to the sufferer: if he presents a guilt-offering, many will benefit by it.[65]

Omitting the obscure details I think that these rather difficult verses may with reasonable confidence be interpreted as follows.

The sick man of the vision is now dead, but he will live in his descendants: he will see seed, and so he will prolong his own life. The descendants are not, however, descendants in a physical, but in a spiritual sense. They are the many to whom he will bring justification; and they are likened to spoil which he is to win. Yahweh declares: 'I will allot him the many for his portion, and a multitude of men shall be his spoil.' That will be the result of his vicarious suffering and death for the benefit of others and of his interposing for the rebellious. For himself this will mean great satisfaction and exaltation, and for Yahweh the fulfilment of His purpose. There is no hint of a real resurrection from death.[66]

[65] In v. 10 I read הַחֲלִי and take the word as an adv. acc.: 'crush him with sickness' (cf. Torrey). The sickness of the suffering man was described in v. 3f. Here the same sickness, followed by death, is mentioned very appropriately as a necessary condition of the success and exaltation of the man. But the reading of DSIa is worth considering: ויחללהו, which could be translated: 'and He (Yahweh) pierced him'. — The second hemistich could be translated: 'if his life presents a gift of atonement', i.e., 'if his life (sacrificed in death) makes expiation' (cf. Torrey). But it may be observed that in Deutero-Isaiah נפשׁ with suffix is frequent for the pronoun (N. H. Snaith in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to T. H. Robinson*, p. 200). Cf. also A. R. Johnson, *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, Cardiff 1949, pp. 19ff. Otherwise Driver, *JTS*, 1935, p. 403.

[66] The expression 'he will see seed' does not mean that the deceased man will rise from the dead. In poetical language it is likewise said of the dead Rachel that she is weeping for her children, refusing to be comforted (Jer. XXXI. 15). The dead one is thought of as being able to follow what happens in the upper world. In the first line of v. 11 DSIa has יראה אור (cf. LXX δεῖξαι αὐτῷ φῶς), which was long ago suggested by commentators. I think this reading ought to be accepted. The meaning is: he will experience good fortune in consequence of all that he has suffered. Then I combine ישׂבע with בדעתו: he will be satisfied by his knowledge (when seeing the abundant seed). The following words are to be translated: 'Being righteous, my servant will procure righteousness to many', which fits very well into the context. Thus we get in the passage 10—11 a long metrical system of 2:2. In v. 12 רבים is obj. to אחלק (for partitive use of ב see Job XXXIX.17, and G-K, § 119 m). The second hemistich expresses metaphorically the same thought. What the servant will obtain as a portion allotted to him by Yahweh is here conceived as a spoil gained in a combat by a victorious warrior. The many are of

It may be observed that all this is seen by the prophet in his vision. In one and the same vision the great drama is played out in different scenes, linked together with great artistic skill: we see before us the figure of the sick man; he bears his suffering with patience; the significance of the suffering as vicarious is interpreted by the bystanders in the form of a confession made in the future; he dies and is buried. From a solemn declaration made by Yahweh we learn what the issue of his suffering and his death will be, and how a sublime divine plan will be fulfilled by Yahweh's suffering servant.

Thus I regard the fourth Servant Song, comprising LIII.2—12, as a prophetic revelation in the form of a vision. It has all the characteristics of a vision: the vagueness and mysteriousness in the mode of expression; the division of what is described into different scenes, partly independent, partly linked with each other; unexpected changes of tense; unexpected changes of speakers and actors, etc. It is not certain that the vision was based upon a real ecstatic experience. Deutero-Isaiah is not a typical ecstatic; and it may be that he merely employs the ecstatic-revelatory form for his messages. A vigorous inspiration of poetical-religious nature can be assumed to be a sufficient psychological basis for the poem we have called the fourth Servant Song.

If the poem is interpreted in this manner, it becomes meaningless to ask *who* is the Servant of Yahweh in the fourth Servant Song. Is he identical with Israel? Is he the prophet himself? Is he the Messiah? Is he a historical individual known or unknown? The suffering man is none of these. He is a fictitious person, who (from the psychological point of view) is conjured up in the prophet's imagination, and (from the religious point of view) is the subject of a divine revelation.[67]

---

course the same as the 'seed 'of v. 10 and 'the many' of v. 11. — For הערה נפשׁו (v. 12) see recently A. R. Johnson in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 86. In v. 12 (end) DSIa has חטאי for חטא, ולפשעיהמה for ולפשׁעים and יפגע for יפגיע. There is no reason for altering the massoretic text. — Concerning the question whether a resurrection from the dead is thought of, W. Eichrodt makes the excellent observation: 'Gewiss ist hier (ch. LIII) in erster Linie von einem neuen Gottesvolk in einer neuen Gotteswelt, und nicht von Auferstehung oder Unsterblichkeit die Rede. Nicht zufällig stösst man sich ja immer wieder daran, dass auch die Auferstehung des Gottesknechtes selber nirgends *verbis expressis* verkündet wird.' *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 3, Leipzig 1939, p. 156.

[67] Concerning the theory, often advanced, that the picture of the suffering servant in Isa. LIII is based on the Tammuz-myth, or the ideas and practices connected with the divine king (so particularly L. Dürr, *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung*, Berlin 1925) or other oriental myths (see among recent scholars especially Nyberg, Engnell, and Bentzen in *Messias. Moses redivivus. Menschensohn*), I am prepared to admit that influences from these spheres o

The poem is not an end in itself. It serves a certain purpose: it points to another series of events, which is not directly expressed in the poem itself, but must be divined by the reader. Precisely like the other Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah, this fourth song is a symbolic narrative, an allegorical picture. We have to ask: How must this narrative be interpreted? What is symbolized by the sick man, with his sufferings, his death, his exaltation?

In the previous Ebed-Yahweh compositions the allegorical picture was immediately followed by an interpretation or rather application. This is not here the case. Here reality comes first, the symbol afterwards. The historical facts are included in the passage LII.13—LIII.1. There, as we have seen, Yahweh manifestly addresses Israel in the exile. Israel is called the servant of Yahweh. Israel is at present in an extremely miserable state: its appearance is so disfigured that many are appalled at it. But Israel will succeed, it will be highly exalted; it is in fact performing a sublime work: through its suffering it makes expiation for many nations, cleansing them from their sins. This work is the reason for its final exaltation.

Each of these features has something corresponding to it in the prophetic vision that follows. There the chief subject is the sick man, called a servant of Yahweh. He is despised and forsaken of men and as one from whom men avert their gaze. But in the future the sufferer will triumph. Many will hail him as their benefactor and saviour. His suffering, borne in patience, will appear as vicarious suffering, undertaken for the benefit of others. Through his suffering the servant makes expiation for a

---

thought and rite may be recognized, within certain limits; cf. recently de Liagre-Böhl, *op. cit.*, p. 92 (wrongly identifying the servant with Israel): 'Gottes Knecht bedeutet für den Prophet das leidende und sterbende Volk Israel. Die Ausdrücke aber, deren er sich bedient, sind die der Weihelieder im Geheimkult.' Similarly J. M. P. Smith and W. A. Irwin, *op. cit.*, pp. 217—240. In this connection may be mentioned the interesting thesis of N. Johansson that the Ebed here and in the other Songs is based on the type of the *parakletoi*, 'Fürsprecherengel', in Israelite-Jewish religion; see his study *Parakletoi. Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Lund 1940, pp. 49—62. My thesis that the Servant Songs are allegorical pictures can in no wise be affected by such theories. For the interpretation of details I am willing to listen to the experts in the history of oriental religion. That the servant *is* the Messiah or a kind of Messiah must, however, be denied according to my theory. — The much debated question of the literary category of the fourth Servant Song is interesting, but of no essential import for my interpretation. For this question see, e.g., H. Jahnow, *Das hebräische Leichenlied im Rahmen der Völkerdichtung*, Giessen 1923, pp. 256—265; Begrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 56ff.; Elliger, *op. cit.*, pp. 19ff.

multitude of men, taking their punishment upon himself. By means of all this a sublime plan of Yahweh will be fulfilled, the salvation of many.

The parallelism between the two sections LII.13—LIII.1 and LIII.2—12 is manifest. The relation between them is the relation between a sequence of actual events and an allegorical picture intended to depict these facts and present them more forcibly to the understanding and the emotions. The parables of the Gospels serve the same purpose. The sick man *is* not Israel but he is a *symbol* of Israel, just as the prodigal son is a symbol of the repentant sinner. Nobody would ask, *Who was* the prodigal son? but, What does the prodigal son *signify*? Nor should we ask, *Who* is the suffering servant in Isa. LIII? The correct question is this: What does the suffering servant *signify*? The right answer to this question is that he signifies Israel in captivity. The suffering people of Israel will recognize itself in the picture of the sick man. In the description of the situation wherein the sick man lives, Israel will recognize its own historical fate; through the declaration of the significance of the afflictions laid upon the sick man and their results, Israel will be brought to a better understanding of the reason for its own suffering. From this understanding Israel is to derive new courage and hope.

It is necessary strictly to distinguish between a narrative of historical facts in the strict sense and a symbolical and allegorical picture. Of a historical narrative we demand that the different features should all correspond to history; of an allegorical picture we demand only that the chief features should have their equivalents in reality. In an allegorical story we always have to reckon with several details which are intended only to adorn the picture and make it more vivid. It would be a wrong and misleading interpretation if someone were to attempt to apply every detail in the description of the sick man and his experiences to Israel and its life. It is often said that certain traits in the description of the sick man are not applicable to Israel. Therefore the sick man, it is maintained, cannot be Israel. But what is true of historical narratives is not true of allegorical pictures.

For instance, several scholars find a difficulty in the death of the sick man. It would be meaningless to say not only that Israel was pained and despised, but also that it died. But in the allegorical picture death in a very natural way follows after the state of sickness. Applied to the historical Israel, sickness and death do not signify anything else than greatly increased suffering. Sickness and death taken together are impressive symbols for the condition of Israel in the captivity.

It is typical of a more extensive allegorical narrative that the narrator is not able consistently to carry through the fictitious element in what he

relates; he intersperses traits from reality into the fiction. This can be exemplified from many parables in the Gospels. This is also the case in the allegorical picture of Isa. LIII. Omitting smaller details, I should like to refer to one passage only. In v. 8b we read: כי נגזר מארץ חיים מפשע עמי נגע למו. As the text stands this must be translated in this way: 'For he was cut off from the land of the living because of the rebellion of those to whom my people was a leper.' The grammatical construction of the second hemistich is very compressed, but not un-Hebraic. A more common construction would be: מפשעם עמי נגע למו. I do not find any reason for changing this text.[68] A gleam of real history here shines through. But this is only to be expected in an allegorical narrative of this extent. If I have correctly interpreted the sentence in question, the allegorical narrative itself says explicitly that the leper is a symbol of the prophet's nation, viz. Israel, that the leprosy is a symbol of the conditions in which Israel lived during the exile, and that Israel's suffering is a vicarious suffering for the benefit of the Gentiles, whose rebellions were the cause of this suffering.

Against those who *identify* the suffering servant with Israel the objection has often been made that Israel, which is frequently blamed by the prophet for its want of faith and its trespasses, could not have been described as innocent and righteous. It may however be borne in mind that Israel during the exile did not form a homogeneous entity. As was evident from the passage L.10—11, a crisis had occurred among the exiles: we find a group of faithful Jews on one side and a group of apostates on the other.[69] When describing the suffering man as a sinless man, and presenting him allegorically as a symbol of Israel, the prophet had before his eyes in the first place those who faithfully adhered to Yahweh and gathered around the prophet as his true disciples. It is to be observed that, when speaking about Israel or to Israel, the prophet sometimes has in mind the historical Israel as a whole, sometimes Israel in Palestine, sometimes Israel in Babylonia, sometimes the pious and faithful among the exiles. Here he thinks of the last group. It was by means of them, of course, and not through the apostates, that Yahweh's sublime plan concerning the salvation of the Gentiles was to be carried out.[70]

[68] נגע with causative sense also v. 5. There the thought is exactly the same as here. נגע means mark of leprosy and leprosy itself, but also a leper, a leprous person (Lev. XIII.4,12,13,17). For the grammatical construction see G-K, § 155 n, and Ps. XLIX.14: זה דרכם כסל למו.

[69] See above, p. 33.

[70] Eissfeldt, who identifies the servant with Israel, says that Israel is described as innocent and righteous in relation to other peoples and men. There is a measure of truth in this statement, too; *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja*, Halle 1933, p. 18.

All those who have attempted to identify the suffering man in Isa. LIII with Israel or with a particular individual have got into great difficulties. When the sufferer is *identified* in this way with anyone, insoluble problems arise. Interpreting the description of the sick man as an *allegorical picture*, we have found a way out of many difficulties and a solution of a number of problems which have hitherto perplexed students of the Old Testament.

There is no need to waste many words upon the question how far the fourth Servant oracle (LII.13—LIII.1+LIII.2—12) fits into the context. The preceding passage (LII.7—12) describes the triumphal progress of the exiled Jews returning from Babylonia to Jerusalem. Yahweh has comforted His people and has bared His holy arm in the sight of all nations. All the ends of the earth are seeing the salvation of God. To these ideas is attached in a very natural way the description in LII.13ff. of the exalting and glorifying of Israel, of the revealing of the arm of Yahweh upon Israel, and of kings shutting their mouths in wonder at what He has done.

The subsequent passage (LIV.1—10) embodies many ideas which allude to the foregoing Servant oracle. Israel will be restored and glorified. Its seed will take possession of the nations. It will forget the shame and humiliation of its previous history. All this is brought about by Yahweh, the Holy One of Israel and the God of all the earth. For a brief moment He forsook His people; with eternal mercy He now takes compassion on it.

It is true that the idea of vicarious suffering is not indicated in the parts of the text which surround the fourth Servant oracle. But this is of no import. To the compiler of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah it was quite sufficient that the whole section played variations on this leading theme, abasement and glorifying, in accordance with the sublime plan of Yahweh.

The result of the researches contained in this chapter is that the so-called Ebed-Yahweh Songs are all allegorical or symbolical pictures, intended to depict Israel's situation in the captivity and Israel's God-given task in relation to the pagan world. Each of the first three Songs is followed by an interpretation or rather application. In the last Song the description of reality comes first; and then follows the symbolic narrative, the object of which is to make the obscure reality clear and obvious to understanding and emotion. In two cases (chs. XLII and LIII) the allegorical narrative is created by the prophet's religious imagination; in two cases (chs. XLIX and L) the personal experiences of the prophet serve as a basis of the narrative. Thus, what the four Ebed Songs have in common is not the figure described, but that they all are allegorical narratives composed with one and the same intention, namely to elucidate one and

the same reality. The decisive question is no longer: *Who* is the Ebed Yahweh in these Songs? but: What are the historical facts which are to be elucidated by the symbols employed. The task of the exegete is here the same as in the parable texts of the Gospels: he has both to explain the symbolical narrative as such, and then to analyze the historical reality which the symbolical narrative points to. These two things must be kept apart without being intermingled with each other. Interpreted in this manner the Ebed-Yahweh Songs, combined with their applications into entities which we call 'Ebed-Yahweh oracles' are no longer like erratic blocks in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah, but fit very well into the context, in accordance to the intentions of whoever compiled this book.

Chapter III.

The Leading Ideas of the Ebed-Yahweh Oracles as Elements in the Message of Deutero-Isaiah.

By the expression 'Ebed-Yahweh oracles' I mean the 'Servant Songs' regarded as allegorical pictures, taken together with the interpretations or applications which follow or precede them. What I propose to attempt in this chapter is to analyze the ideas met with in those compositions and examine how far they fit into the message of Deutero-Isaiah as a whole.

The leading ideas of the Ebed-Yahweh oracles are the following:

Israel is chosen by Yahweh, the God of Israel, its Redeemer and its Holy One, in order to perform, as the servant of Yahweh, a great task in the world (typical terms: בחר, קרא, עבד; גאל, קדוש[1]).

To be able to carry out that charge, to be an instrument of Yahweh's purpose in the world, Israel is upheld by Yahweh and endowed by Him with divine gifts (typical terms: תמך ביד, החזיק, רוח[2]).

In order that Israel may be able to perform its task, it must be preserved by Yahweh, it must not be bruised or swept away (typical terms: נצר, לא ירוץ, לא נאסף[3]).

Israel's task in the world is to mediate welfare to the pagan nations. This task will be performed in a double way. First, Israel will be a witness among the pagans to faith in Yahweh, to the true religion. Secondly, Israel's suffering is intended to be vicarious suffering. Israel takes upon itself the penalty which the Gentiles had to pay for their rebellions. Through witnessing and suffering, but not through violent measures, Israel will bring salvation to the pagan nations. So Yahweh's plan will be realized (typical terms: יוציא משפט, תורה, אור, ישועה, יצדיק, יזה, חפץ יהוה, יצלח[4]).

---

[1] XLII.1,6, XLIX.1,7, LII.13.

[2] XLII.1,6.

[3] XLII.4,6, XLIX.5,6.

[4] XLII.1,3,4,6, XLIX.6, LII.15, LIII.4f., 10,11.

The final goal will be a redeemed humanity. Israel will be the centre of a confederation of peoples, subject to Yahweh, the God of Israel and the Creator of heaven and earth (typical terms: ברית עם, יראה זרע, שלל, חלק ברבים[5]).

The Gentiles, at present living in blindness and darkness, are prepared in their hearts for that goal. They wait to share in the true faith and to become subject to Yahweh. They are highly esteemed by Yahweh, not an object of vengeance and punishment, but destined for welfare and salvation (typical term: לתורתו איים יחלו[6]).

The realizing of that goal will imply both the glorifying of Yahweh and the exaltation of Israel, the people of Yahweh. Kings will arise and princes prostrate themselves because of Yahweh. Israel will succeed, be lifted up, and greatly exalted (typical terms: אתפאר; כבוד יהוה, תהלת; ישכיל, ירום, מלכים יקומו[7]).

The mission of Israel to the world, accomplished by witnessing and vicarious suffering, is the culmination of the message of Yahweh to his people. This mission, the glorifying of Yahweh, and exalting of the chosen people are called *new things*, which Yahweh now declares (typical term: חדשות[8]).

Israel lives at present in miserable conditions. It is a slave of tyrant rulers and abhorred by the heathen. It is disfigured and despised and like a sick man, spreading infection. It is, moreover, filled with despondency and despair. It regards its life as worthless (typical terms: עבד משלים, מתעב, שמם, נגע, בזה נפש[9]).

A great part of the nation, living in exile, has fallen away from Yahweh and abandoned the path of the *tôrâh*. Unbelief and apostasy are prevalent. Many no longer listen to the message of the prophet. If Israel is to be able to carry out its charge, it must repent and become obedient to the words of the prophet. The nation is disunited. Over against the apostates there stands the group of the faithful. The apostates, the enemies of the faithful, will have to pay the penalty. They will lie down in torments (מעצבה)[10].

Inasmuch as the people as a whole appeared to be unable to fulfil

[5] XLII.6, LIII.10,12.

[6] XLII,4.

[7] XLII.8, XLIX.3,7, LII.13,15.

[8] XLII.9. But this term can, of course, in other passages signify other things. Cf. North in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, pp. 111—126.

[9] XLIX.7, LII.14, LIII.2ff.

[10] L.11. For the various groups within the Babylonian *gôlâh*, including idolaters, too, see J. Hempel, 'Vom irrenden Glauben', pp. 636f. and 642; R. Kittel, *Gestalten und Gedanken in Israel*, 2. Aufl., Leipzig, pp. 389—431 (esp. pp. 392ff.).

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

Yahweh's purpose, the prophet fixed his eyes upon the faithful among them, the company of his disciples. They are called 'those who fear Yahweh'. He understood that they alone could perform the task given the chosen people by its God. They are at present despised and persecuted by those of their compatriots who have fallen away. They are now urged by the prophet to hearken to his voice, trust in the name of Yahweh and lean upon their God. Yahweh will surely help them and vindicate them. Therefore they must take courage and be of good cheer. Believing in God, listening to the message of the prophet, being innocent and righteous, and patiently bearing their distress, they are qualified to be the instrument in Yahweh's hand, by which, in due time, His purpose will be accomplished (typical terms: ירא יהוה, שמע בקול, בטח; עזר, הצדיק[11]).

Through this message concerning the import of Israel's life in exile, the people would be brought to a better understanding of the apparently hopeless situation. It would see light in the darkness, and receive consolation and encouragement.

When examining the other sayings of Deutero-Isaiah, we find that there are a number of oracles the contents of which closely correspond to the leading ideas of the Ebed-Yahweh oracles. In that group I include the following passages:

XLV.20—25. All the ends of the earth are summoned to turn to Yahweh, the only God, that they may be saved (הושׁעו). Every knee will bow, every tongue will swear to Yahweh. The conversion of the Gentiles is the contents of a new prophetic message, not before revealed. Because of the conversion of the Gentiles Israel will be justified and have reason to exult in Yahweh.[12]

LI.4—6. Yahweh's law (תורה) and ordinances (משׁפט) will be known and established (יצא) in the world for the welfare (אור) of the pagan nations. Yahweh's salvation (צדק, ישׁע) is at hand, His arm will govern and judge (שׁפט) the nations. The far coasts are waiting for Him and for the manifestation of His power (איים יקוו). The similarity between the ideas, and even the expressions, in this passage and those in the first Ebed-Yahweh oracle is striking.[13]

[11] L.7,8,9,10, LIII.9.

[12] 'The survivors of the nations' XLV.20 are those who have been rescued from the sword of Cyrus. As will be shown below, the group of oracles to which this passage belongs is from the time after the formidable conquests of the Persian king.

[13] On this passage Snaith comments: 'The passage tells of the judgement which God is about to bring upon the heathen. They will wait for Him and His strength, but with dread rather than in hope and trust'; *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 199. This curious remark is connected with Snaith's general theory of the consistently nationalistic view of Deutero-Isaiah. In my opinion a universalist view

LI.7—8. A special group of the people is here addressed. They are described as those who know righteousness (ידעי צדק) and bear Yahweh's *tôrâh* in their hearts (תורה בלבם). They must not fear (אל תיראו) the insults of men, nor be frightened by their blaspheming. For the moth will devour their enemies as a garment; the worm will consume them as wool. But Yahweh's righteousness (צדקה) will abide for ever and His salvation (ישועה) through all the ages. The affinity of this passage with the third Ebed-Yahweh oracle L.4—11 is obvious.[14]

LV.1—5. Yahweh will make an eternal compact (ברית) with His people; He will confer upon them the favour assured to David. As king David was a witness (עד) to the peoples, a leader and commander of the nations, Israel will call upon nations it does not know, people who do not know Israel will run unto it, since they have realized the power of Yahweh, the God of Israel. In this passage, which deals with the spiritual empire of Israel, we meet with another expression of the idea of ברית עם, the confederation of peoples with Israel as its centre (cf. XLII.6). The same idea is in ch. LIII expressed through the symbols of 'the seed of the suffering servant', 'the prolonged days', 'the portion of the many', and 'the abundant spoil'. The idea of the conversion of the Gentiles is common to nearly all oracles of this group.[15]

---

was characteristic of this prophet in the period after the surrender of Babylon. See further below. — In the first line the words עמי and לאומי call for discussion. See BH and the commentaries. I think that עמי and לאומים should be read. The following message concerns the pagan nations as well as Israel.

[14] Those who know righteousness and have Yahweh's *tôrâh* in their hearts are the same as those who fear Yahweh and hearken to the voice of the prophet in L.10. The category of people so described does not include all Israel, as Kissane maintains, nor 'the remnant' in the eschatological sense, but the pious and faithful among the exiles, the true adherents of the prophet.

[15] In the invitation to listen to the arresting message which follows, the prophet uses an impressive metaphor taken from the cries of street traders in eastern towns and villages (cf. J. Lindblom, 'Det offentliga talet i det gamla Israel', in *Studier tilegnede Frants Buhl*, Köbenhavn 1925, pp. 112—126). In his Commentary Bentzen says that this is the first occurrence of the invitation to the eschatological Messianic meal. I cannot agree. The prophet here simply appeals for a receiving of his vital message about the new covenant, a message which is intended to revive courage and hope in the hearts of the despairing people. The suggestion of Torrey, and Gressmann, *Der Messias*, p. 200, n. 1, that נתתיך should be read in v. 4 would destroy the point of the saying. We expect to be told which elements in David's character and achievement are to be reproduced in Israel. The first הן introduces a saying about David, the second a corresponding saying about Israel. The description of David as a witness is manifestly influenced by the idea, so characteristic of Deutero-Isaiah, that Israel is called to be a witness to the nations. — For the term נגיד see recently J. van der Ploeg, 'Les chefs du peuple d' Israël et leur titres',

In this group I should also include the following passages, although their contents are more general and indeterminate.

XLVIII.1—11. The prophet's view of the religious state of his people in this passage is rather pessimistic. They worship their God 'not in truth, nor in righteousness', they are stubborn and stiff-necked, treacherous and rebellious. In this passage the prophet is looking at the people of Israel as a whole: the exiles represent the people throughout its whole history. Therefore he can even speak of them as idolaters. But Yahweh intends, nevertheless, to glorify (תהלה, כבוד) Himself through this people. Therefore He cannot exterminate it (לא הכרית). No account is given of the ultimate goal; but we can surmise that the prophet thinks of the salvation of the pagan nations by means of Israel. These are the new things (חדשות) now pronounced by Yahweh through His prophet. The contents of this passage are closely related to L.4—11 (the pessimistic view; cf. LI.7f.), to XLII.9 (the new things; cf. XLV.21), and to XLII.6, XLIX.5 (Israel will be preserved and not swept away).[16]

XLVIII.17—19. This passage contains an exhortation to repentance: 'If only you would hearken to my bidding, your prosperity would be as a river and your welfare like waves of the sea.' This exhortation presupposes a pessimistic view of the people, analogous to that which we met with in XLVIII.1—11. The phrases used are in some measure conventional, but when it is said that the people will never be extermin-

---

Revue biblique, 57, 1950, pp. 40—61. — It is curious that Volz divides this passage into two: 1—3a and 3b—5. Such a division ruins the whole oracle, separating the appeal for a hearing from the important message itself. — The oracle Isa. LV. 1—5 has recently been interpreted in a quite original way by J. Morgenstern in an article 'Two Prophecies from 520—516 B. C.', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 22, 1949. That article contains some very important observations on the method of interpreting prophetical oracles in general, but with the author's opinion concerning our passage I cannot agree. He dates it in 520 B. C., the critical days of Haggai, and holds that verses 1—2 refer to the historical famine of that time, and that the kingdom of Zerubbabel and the building of the Temple are both indicated. But the expressions in vv. 1—2 seem to me to be entirely metaphorical. Of Zerubbabel and the Temple I cannot discern any hint at all. Israel as nation is about to see the fulfilment of the promise of an everlasting eternal world-kingdom, and the word פארך v. 5 refers to the general idea of the exaltation of Israel. The seeming contradiction between this oracle and the Cyrus oracles can easily be removed by dating Isa. LV.1—5 after 539, when in the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah Cyrus recedes in the background. See further below. — For the introductory phrases see further Driver, *JTS*, 1935, p. 404.

[16] Snaith thinks that this passage is addressed to those who were left behind in Jerusalem after the first deportation, *op. cit.*, p. 197. It cannot be denied that several difficulties are bound up with this oracle, but I think that it is easily fitted into the series of Deutero-Isaianic oracles, when interpreted as above.

ated (יכרת) or destroyed (ישמיד) if it observes the commands of Yahweh, these expressions call to mind the corresponding terms in XLII.6, XLVIII.9, and XLIX.5.

Akin to that passage is LV.6—7, which is likewise dominated by the thought of the necessity of repentance: 'Seek Yahweh while He may be found, call upon Him while He is near', etc. I am not convinced of the authenticity of these verses — they contain no typical Deutero-Isaianic expressions —; but if they are attributed to Deutero-Isaiah, they must be included in this group.

The thought of Israel's repentance expressed in the two last pieces corresponds to XLIX.2, where the preaching of the prophet is likened to a sharp sword and a polished arrow, indicating its denunciatory nature, and XLIX.5—6, where it is said that the prophet's task had once been to bring back Jacob to God and restore the tribes of Jacob.

The affinity of the passages here treated with the Ebed-Yahweh compositions in the strict sense is obvious. There are good grounds for recognizing in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah a special group of oracles which we may appropriately call *the missionary revelations*, dealing with the missionary charge incumbent upon Israel in relation to the Gentiles, and culminating in the Ebed-Yahweh oracles. The main themes of these 'missionary revelations' are the salvation of the Gentiles, Israel as the instrument of their salvation, and how Israel is to be prepared for the fulfilment of this task.

We now pass over to the remaining oracles in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah. It will appear that they likewise are dominated by a relatively homogeneous group of ideas, essentially different from those met with in 'the missionary revelations'. We may call them *the triumphal revelations*, because their chief themes are the triumphal deliverance of Israel from Babylonia and the inflicting of vengeance on vanquished enemies. These 'triumphal revelations' culminate in the Cyrus oracles.

XL.1—2. Israel's warfare is fully achieved and her penance accepted. Now the nation may be consoled and has reason to be of good cheer; its deliverance is approaching.[17]

XL.3—5. Israel will return to Palestine across the wilderness on well prepared ways. Yahweh leads its way, and all mankind shall witness the triumph of Israel.[18]

---

[17] This passage is to be regarded as an utterance of the prophet, containing a message from Yahweh addressed to Deutero-Isaiah himself and other prophets of that time: now the time for rebuke and denunciation is over; the time of consolation and encouragement is come.

[18] It is pointless to try to establish the identity of the one who cries, or of those

XL.6—8. Men are mortal, but Yahweh's word, i.e. His promises concerning the deliverance of His people, made known through the oracles of the prophets, stands for ever.[19]

XL.9—11. Zion is summoned as a herald to announce to the cities of Judah the return of the exiles. Yahweh Himself comes with might and His released people with Him.

XL.12—31. Yahweh's power is manifested in creation and history. The pagans and their idols are nothing in comparison with Him. Therefore despondent Israel must be of good cheer and believe in the approaching deliverance.

XLI.1—5a. The victorious progress of Cyrus. He vanquishes nations and treads kings under foot. All this is ultimately the work of Yahweh. When the far coasts and the ends of the earth behold it, they will tremble and be afraid.[20]

[XLI.5b—7. A fragment concerning the foolishness of idolaters and the impotence of idols, belonging to another context.]

XLI.8—13. Israel's enemies will perish all together and be as nothing, but Israel itself will be strengthened by Yahweh and triumph.

XLI.14—16. Israel will violently throw down all obstacles raised on its way; it will crush all its adversaries, and exult in its God.

XLI.17—20. The exiles in their distress are likened to men who seek water but do not find it, and whose tongue is parched with thirst. But great blessings will come to them through the wonderful manifestation of the power of Yahweh.

XLI.21—29. The victorious progress of Cyrus. None among the idols has been able to foretell these things. Only Yahweh has predicted them through His prophets. The idols and the idolaters are nothing.[21]

---

who are to prepare the way of Yahweh. Such mysterious figures belong to the scenery of the revelatory literature (cf. J. Lindblom, *Die literarische Gattung*, p. 48f.).

[19] The original text of DSIa is here, as we know, shorter than the massoretic text. It runs: 'All flesh is grass, and all its beauty is as the flower of the field. The grass withers, the flower fades, but the word of our God shall stand for ever.' I think that this text is to be accepted. It is also the text of LXX and 1 Pet. I. 24f.

[20] In spite of the arguments advanced by Kissane in favour of Abraham, I accept the usual view that this passage deals with Cyrus. The description of the victorious conqueror in 2—3 cannot appropriately be applied to the Patriarch, but only to the Persian king, in his triumphant progress. (Is it too audacious to assume that Cyrus is the subject of the second יתן in v. 2, and that the Lydian king is indicated in the following singular suffixes?) The difficulties in the way of the customary explanation can easily be dealt with. Cf. further Haller in *Eucharisterion* to Gunkel, pp. 261—277.

[21] The arguments advanced by Snaith in *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*,

XLII.10—17. Yahweh goes forth like a mighty hero to throw down all His foes and help His people. His mighty deeds are described in vivid metaphors. But the idolaters shall be utterly ashamed. Because of what has happened humanity is summoned to sing a new song to Yahweh and His praise from the end of the earth.[22]

XLII.18—XLIII.13. Israel in exile does not understand its own situation: it is blind and deaf. It is maimed, not because of the power of its enemies, nor because of the powerlessness of Yahweh, but because of the sins which it had committed during its earlier history. It was Yahweh's plan that His *tôrâh* should be glorified through Israel, but Israel repudiated the *tôrâh*. Israel is nevertheless elected by Yahweh. Therefore Yahweh will deliver His people and bring it back to its own country from all quarters of the world. And no one will be able to resist Him in performing His work.

XLIII.14—15. Prophecy of the overthrow of Babylon.

XLIII.16—21. Yahweh is going to perform a new miracle comparable to the miracle of the Exodus: He will make ways in the wilderness and put water in the desert for the benefit of the returning exiles.

XLIII.22—XLIV.5. Israel has been allowed to go into captivity because of its sins committed in its past history. But Yahweh blots out its iniquities and forgives them for His own sake, not because of anything that Israel has done, and, in particular, not because of Israel's faithfulness in cultic practice, which, of course, has been impossible during the exile. So great is Yahweh's love to His people and so firmly are its deliverance and welfare guaranteed. For this reason the people may be of good cheer. It will surely be re-established as a nation according to its calling as the elect people of Yahweh.[23]

---

p. 193, against Cyrus and in favour of Jacob-Israel as the subject in this passage, are too vague to overthrow the usual explanation. From a Babylonian point of view it could equally well be said that Cyrus came from the north as that he came from the east (v. 25). He was born in the east, but as conqueror of Babylonia he arrived from the north. Cf. S. Smith, *op. cit.*, p. 51: Cyrus had marched from the east to the north. From the north the attack on the Babylonian governors is in preparation. Compare also p. 161.

[22] Mowinckel, *ZAW*, 1931, p. 96, takes verses 10—17 as forming one section. That is possible but not absolutely necessary. The little poem vv. 10—12 can be taken as an entity, equally well fitted to form the conclusion of XLII.1—9 as the introduction to XLII.13—17. Engnell says: verses 10—12 give the hymnic conclusion of the previous passage in elaborate 'enthronement psalm' style; *op. cit.*, p. 66.

[23] The interpretation of this passage is bound up with several difficulties. The commentaries are extremely diverse and contradictory. See also recently H. W. Hertzberg in *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 1950, 219ff. I think the correct explan-

XLIV.6—8. Yahweh surpasses the pagan gods in foretelling what will come to pass. He is the only God, the true God. The pagan gods do not know anything and are nothing. Even now great events are taking place — the appearance of Cyrus and his victories. Yahweh alone knew them beforehand and foretold them through His prophets.[24]

XLIV.9—20. Derision of idols and idolaters. This passage may also be included in the first group.

XLIV.21—22. Yahweh has forgiven Israel its sins committed in the past. The people is now summoned to turn to Yahweh in faith and confidence; then it will be redeemed and delivered by Yahweh.

XLIV.23—28. Yahweh is going to fulfil the prophecies. Jerusalem and the Temple will be rebuilt and all the ruins in the country restored. All this will come to pass through the initiative of Cyrus, the instrument of Yahweh's purpose.

XLV.1—8. The victorious progress of Cyrus, whom Yahweh has called and prepared to be the instrument of His designs.

XLV.9—13. To criticize Yahweh's conduct and mode of action is as absurd as if a potsherd were to criticize the potter or a child its parents. Through the work of Cyrus, Jerusalem will be built up and the captives set free.

XLV.14—19. Israel will triumph over the pagan nations and be saved with enduring salvation. Yahweh himself guarantees these things, He who has created the heavens and the earth and has openly announced His plans through the messages of his prophets.

---

ation is the following. Yahweh is about to rescue and restore His people. The question now arises: why is Yahweh willing to perform this deed? The first verse gives part of the answer: the people has not itself called upon Him. What is meant by 'called upon', is indicated by the reference to the sacrifices which have not been offered, obviously during the years of the exile. This explanation is supported, it seems to me, by the text of DSIa, which characteristically diverges from the text of the Massoretes. It begins v. 23: לוא הביאותה לי שה לעולה. See further my article in *ZAW*, 63, 1951. Israel has indeed nothing to offer, but its sins and transgressions committed during its earlier history, ending in ruin and captivity (24b—28). Its sins are however forgiven by the free grace of Yahweh and on no other ground (v. 25). That is the only guarantee of a prosperous future and the welfare of Israel. And this guarantee holds. XLIV.5 describes how in the future the election of Israel will be accomplished. The reference is not to proselytes, but to the Israelites themselves. The verse must be understood against the background of XLIII.24—28. The actual Israel, now rebellious, will in the future be conformed to the ideal of the elect people. Cf. Jer. XXXI.33—34. See further J. Lindblom, *Profetismen i Israel*, pp. 460ff.

[24] I agree fully with North's view that in v. 7 the things announced are called אתיות in a quite general sense; *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy*, p. 123.

XLVI.1—2. The approaching downfall of Babylon.

XLVI.3—7. Yahweh is going to rescue His people, which he has taken care of from the beginning of its history. In contrast to Him the pagan gods have proved powerless.

XLVI.8—13. The purpose of Yahweh will be brought to pass through Cyrus, whose deeds have been foretold through the prophets from ancient times. The deliverance of the exiles is not far off. In a short time Zion will be saved from its distress.

XLVII.1—15. The imminent destruction of Babylon.

XLVIII.12—16. The victorious Cyrus, Yahweh's beloved, will perform Yahweh's purpose against Babylon, according to the earlier prophecies openly announced.

XLVIII.20—22. The deliverance of the captives and their return to their own country.

XLIX.8—21. The captives will be released in the immediate future. From all quarters they will be assembled and return to their own country across the well-watered wilderness. The Jewish state will be re-established in glory. Zion doubts Yahweh's good will; but the prophet attempts to raise its confidence by reminding it that Israel has been chosen by Yahweh, and that Yahweh cannot forget His own people. The prophet sees as in a vision how already the exiles assemble and come back to Zion.[25]

XLIX.22—23. Israel's triumph over its enemies, the pagan nations. They will bring the exiles back to Palestine in their bosom and on their

---

[25] It is clear that XLIX.8 is the beginning of a new section because v. 7 must be taken together with the preceding Song, both passages forming an Ebed-Yahweh oracle (see above pp. 27ff.). Where, then, does this section end? Several scholars think that the next section begins with v. 14, but ותאמר ציון does not seem to be an appropriate beginning for a new oracle if Deutero-Isaiah's characteristic style is a fair guide. Indeed the objection from Zion's side v. 14 fits very naturally and impressively into the context. It is unquestionable that it is Zion that is addressed in this passage, not the Ebed Yahweh of the Servant Songs. If so the logical subject of להקים and להנחיל XLIX.8 must be Yahweh, or the forms are rather to be explained as gerundives (cf. G-K, § 114 o): 'In the time of grace I will answer thee, in the day of rescue I will help thee, that the land may be restored, the desolate inheritances allotted, and that it may be said to the prisoners, Come forth', etc. The phrase ואצרך ואתנך לברית עם does not fit into the context. It has presumably been inserted here from XLII. 6 — perhaps already in the oral tradition — by someone who understood it as referring to the Ebed Yahweh proper and identified the subject of XLIX.8ff. with the Ebed, both assumptions being equally erroneous. Elliger thinks that we have to do with an addition by Trito-Isaiah (*op. cit.*, pp. 54ff.). It may, moreover, be observed that the terms 'preserve' and 'confederation of peoples' do not belong to this group of 'triumphal revelations', but to the group of 'missionary revelations' (see further below).

shoulders. They will bow down to them with face to the ground; and they will lick the dust of their feet.

XLIX.24—26. Though Israel's adversaries seem to be powerful, Yahweh will show that He is mighty enough to strive with the tyrants and save the captives. He will make the oppressors eat their own flesh and be drunk with their own blood.

L.1—3. Yahweh has not finally rejected His people, nor has He been forced to abandon it. Its misfortune has been caused by its sins. Therefore Yahweh is not prevented from saving it as He pleases. He has also the necessary power, as is proved by His wonderful deeds in nature.

LI.1—3. Yahweh will restore the Jewish state and the Jewish homeland. Jerusalem will be rebuilt, the land cultivated, the inhabitants happy. This is guaranteed by what Yahweh did long ago for Abraham, the father of the chosen people.

LI.9—11. A prayer to Yahweh that He may manifest His power as He did when He vanquished the powers of Chaos and when He delivered the Israelites at the first exodus. A reply is given: the redeemed of Yahweh will return and come to Zion with rejoicing.

LI.12—16. Israel fears its adversaries, who are mortal men, and forgets Yahweh the mighty Creator of the world, who has also chosen Israel. But Israel will be released, the captives will speedily be set free.

LI.17—23. Description of the afflictions which have fallen upon Israel as a chastisement for its crimes committed in the past. But Israel is chosen by Yahweh, and now the time has come when Yahweh's wrath is to be turned against the oppressors: the cup of wrath is to be taken from Israel's hand and placed in the hand of its enemies.

LII.1—6. Restoration of the Jewish state.

LII.7—12. The exiles return to their own country. The herald brings good tidings concerning the salvation of Israel, and the watchmen cry out that Yahweh is on His way back to Zion.

LIV.1—10. The capital and the land of Judah will be densely populated again. Desolate cities will be rebuilt and inhabited. For a brief moment Yahweh forsook His people, but now with eternal mercy He will take compassion on it. Because Yahweh is Israel's God and its Redeemer.

LIV.11—17. The magnificent glory of Jerusalem, the rebuilt capital of Judah. The re-established nation will in the future live in security and peace.

LV.8—13. Yahweh's thoughts concerning the future of His people are quite different from the thoughts of the exiles. They lived in fear and

doubt and did not understand what was about to happen in contemporary history. Yahweh's promises will certainly be realized. The exiles will be restored to Palestine; and the prosperity of people and land will be permanent.

Even a hasty glance at these revelations, over forty in number, shows that they are all dominated by the thoughts of Israel's victory, its deliverance, return, and future glory. They can therefore, it seems to me, very appropriately be called 'the triumphal revelations' in contrast to 'the missionary revelations', eleven in number, which were examined previously.

The ideas met with in 'the triumphal revelations' may be summed up as follows:

The afflictions which have fallen upon Israel are to be regarded as punishment for sins committed in the past. Now the penalty has been paid, and the sin expiated; and forgiveness can be proclaimed.

Israel is for the present weighed down by discouragement and despondency. Want of faith is the charge brought against the people. It is blind and deaf: it does not understand its own situation, nor the ways of its God. It criticizes unwisely the actions of Yahweh.

The task incumbent upon the prophet is to console and encourage the people, to restore its faith and confidence in Yahweh. The time of suffering, the 'warfare' of the people, is rapidly coming to an end. Yahweh has power: He is the God of creation, of history, of prophecy, while the idols and the idolaters are utterly ineffective. Israel is His chosen people; and the election stands secure. Yahweh's promises will be fulfilled. His word will not be frustrated, but will be effective.

In a short time the people will be released; it will return in triumph and experience a second exodus. Yahweh will return in splendour to Zion at the head of the exiles. Ways are to be prepared across the wilderness. The desert will be well watered and fertile.

Jerusalem and the Temple will be rebuilt, the nation restored, the land cultivated as before. Security, peace, and prosperity will reign in the re-established state of Judah. The ideal of the chosen people will be realized.

Cyrus stands at the centre of history as conqueror and victor. He is the chosen instrument in Yahweh's hand, through which Yahweh will perform His purpose for Israel. He was foretold in the prophecies; and his actions imply the fulfilment of the promises.

The pagan nations are to be crushed, Babylon and the Babylonian dominion overthrown, every resistance ruthlessly defeated. Israel will take cruel vengeance in its enemies. The foreign peoples are bitterly

hated and deeply despised. They will be Israel's slaves. Yahweh Himself will go forth as a warrior fighting for His people.

The idols will be destroyed. Idolaters and augurs will be put to shame.

The Gentiles will stand amazed at Yahweh's mighty deeds and the wonderful deliverance of the exiles. Through these events Israel will be a witness to the Gentiles of Yahweh and His omnipotence; and Israel will praise Yahweh's holy name.

The two groups of revelations here analysed have, of course, a number of ideas in common: the election of Israel, Israel as the servant of Yahweh, Yahweh as the God of history, of creation, and of prophecy, the impotence of the idols and the idolaters, the distress of Israel, the prophet's task of consoling and encouraging his despairing compatriots by teaching them a better understanding of their actual situation, Israel's exaltation, and the glorification of Yahweh in the world.

But the differences are essential. In 'the missionary revelations' Israel's positive task in the world stands in the foreground. Through Israel as His instrument Yahweh will save the Gentiles and create a spiritual empire in the world, dominated by the *tôrâh*, and with the chosen people as its centre and its head. In 'the triumphal revelations' the hope of deliverance stands at the centre. Israel will triumph over its enemies and a new Jewish state, splendid and mighty, will be established. In the former group the Gentiles are described as waiting for the true faith, as able to believe in Yahweh through religious conversion, and as an object of salvation. In the latter group the Gentiles are hated and despised, an object of the most cruel vengeance, and described as future slaves of the Israelites. In 'the missionary revelations' the people is described as to a large extent fallen away from Yahweh and the *tôrâh*. Only a part of the people, those who hold fast to God and the *tôrâh*, is capable of carrying out the high task entrusted to Israel. In 'the triumphal revelations' Israel's crimes committed during its past history are alone taken into consideration. Now their sins have been expiated and forgiveness is proclaimed. What the people is blamed for at present is its want of faith in Yahweh's mercy and power to help.[26]

[26] On two points objections may be expected in this connection. It can firstly be maintained that the idea of the conversion of the Gentiles occurs also in 'the triumphal revelations', and secondly that in them, too, the *gôlâh* is described as sinful and apostate. It may, however, be observed that the idea of the amazement of the Gentiles, which is typical of 'the triumphal revelations', does not include the idea of conversion. To stand there amazed and terrified because of the manifestation of Yahweh's omnipotence and to be filled with wonder at His unique greatness and mighty power is not the same as to be incorporated in the new *bᵉrît*. As to the spiritual state of the *gôlâh* it may be remembered that in 'the triumphal revelations'

It seems difficult to deny that each one of these two groups of ideas represents a consistent and logically coherent line of thought. This internal coherence guarantees the essential correctness of the classification here undertaken.

Within the group of 'the triumphal revelations' two smaller, subordinate groups can further be distinguished. One of them is characterized by the fact that the hope of deliverance is connected with actual historical events, above all with the person of Cyrus and his victories, though Cyrus is not expressly named in every passage. Cyrus is here presented to us as a successful conqueror, who is going to release the exiles and order Jerusalem and the Jewish nation to be restored. The deliverance is at hand. In these 'Cyrus revelations' in a special or general sense I include the following passages: XL.9—11, XLI.1—5, XLI.21—29, XLII.10—17, XLIII.14—15, 16—21, XLIV.6—8, XLIV.23—28, XLV.1—8, XLV.9—13, XLVI.1—2, XLVI.8—13, XLVII.1—15, XLVIII.12—16, XLVIII.20—22, XLIX.8—21, LII.1—6, LII.7—12, LIV.1—10, LIV.11—17, LV.8—13.

In the other group the prophet speaks of the future in more general terms. The deliverance is here rather an object of religious hope and belief, founded upon the promises of God in general, than connected with historical facts. Cyrus and his work are here not referred to, either directly or indirectly. These passages are (with some possible modifications): XL.1—2, XL.3—5, XL.6—8, XL.12—31, XLI.8—13, XLI.14—16, XLI.17—20, XLII.18—XLIII.13, XLIII.22—XLIV.5, XLIV.9—20, XLIV.21—22, XLV.14—19, XLVI.3—7, XLIX.22—23, XLIX.24—26, L.1—3, LI.1—3, LI.9—11, LI.12—16, LI.17—23.

It is not possible to draw precise lines of demarcation between these two groups. Several passages can be included in either group. What is important is not the allocation of individual oracles, but the recognition of the nuances which really exist.[27]

---

it is blamed only for its want of faith — it may be that the prophet sometimes uses rather extreme expressions (e.g. XLVI.8ff.).

[27] I have not here discussed the question whether perhaps some passages in 'Proto-Isaiah', or in 'Trito-Isaiah', ought to be attributed to 'the Second Isaiah'. In the first place I think of passages such as Isa. XXXV,LX,LXI, LXII. It is on the other hand quite possible that some passages of the so-called Deutero-Isaiah are not from the nameless prophet himself. I agree with those scholars who think that we have to reckon both with a great prophetical personality and also with a circle of his disciples and followers, and that it is quite impossible in all cases to decide with certainty what belongs to the prophet and what belongs to the imitators. For my purpose it is of no importance if one passage more or less is to be referred to the prophet known as Deutero-Isaiah. The main lines of the

Are these different groups of oracles with their varying contents attributable to the same prophet? I think in the first place of the two principal groups. Between the subordinate groups of 'the triumphal revelations' there is no essential difference in contents.

As is well known, the apparently contradictory lines of thought within the oracles of the Second Isaiah have caused considerable difficulties to critical scholars. The Ebed-Yahweh Songs, for instance, have been declared as unauthentic just because of their distinctive contents. The same is true of a passage such as XLVIII.1—11 with its exceptionally pessimistic view of the spiritual conditions among the exiles.[28]

To my mind it is not thinkable that the prophet at one and the same time proclaimed the conversion of the Gentiles by means of Israel and held out the dark prospect that Israel was going to take cruel vengeance on them. If we were obliged to accept such an opinion, we should have to give up our conception of the prophets as men living in touch with realities and intending, in a concrete historical situation, to influence their compatriots towards a definite goal. In this respect it is immaterial whether the prophets were exclusively speakers or, possibly, under certain circumstances disseminated their messages by means of written documents. As I take it, we must reckon with both of these alternatives. It is well known that those scholars who think that the prophets were dependent to a very large extent on previously fixed oriental doctrines or 'patterns' have been forced to maintain that, for example, the pro-

---

Deutero-Isaianic preaching are, it seems to me, entirely clear. If the chapters mentioned above were to be reckoned to our prophet, they would in any case, be included in 'the triumphal revelations'. For the 'traditio-historical' problems see further among others Engnell, *op. cit.*, pp. 59ff., and 'Profetia och tradition' in *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 12, 1947, pp. 110—139; H. Birkeland, *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen. Die Komposition der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Oslo 1938, and, recently, C. Lindhagen, *op. cit.*, p. 198.

[28] Duhm, Cheyne, Marti, Buhl and other scholars have attempted to get rid of the difficulties presented by this passage by assuming a number of secondary interpolations. Other commentators ask what would have been the purpose of such an 'interlinear commentary'. For the present the unity of the passage in essentials is defended by many scholars, e.g. Mowinckel, Volz, Glahn (in L. Glahn and L. Köhler, *Der Prophet der Heimkehr*, Kopenhagen and Giessen 1934, pp. 15ff.), Bentzen etc. Begrich also defends its substantial authenticity, but thinks that the passage XLVIII. 1—11 consists of two different Deutero-Isaianic oracles (*op. cit.*, p. 171f.). For my own view see above, p. 56. The exceptionally dark description of the spiritual state of Israel here presented can be explained on the ground that the prophet sees before his eyes Israel as a whole, represented by the apostate part of the exiles, disregarding for the moment the pious and faithful elements of the *gôlâh*.

phets at the same time preached both doom and salvation. I wonder whether these scholars are aware that on this view of the Israelite prophets they have really transformed them into theoretical dogmatists, contrary to the whole Israelite tradition, according to which these prophets in every concrete situation proclaimed precisely what the listeners had need of, either doom and punishment or consolation and salvation, but not a previously fixed scheme.

I cannot imagine that the prophet whom we call Deutero-Isaiah proclaimed at the same time the conversion, or salvation, of the Gentiles *and* their subjugation or annihilation. It is inconceivable that the prophet in this manner contradicted himself. It would also be a quite arbitrary makeshift if someone were to attribute the different groups of revelations to different prophets. The difficulty can, it seems to me, be better removed in another way. As we know, the historical situation in which the Second Isaiah lived was extremely unstable and subject to violent change. The prophet did not live in a secluded monastic cell, but in the midst of real life; and he kept constant watch on what was happening on the stage of history. Every change in the course of historical events could be of importance for the destiny of his people. He could not be deaf to the voices of the time. All tidings about the political vicissitudes of his age must have deeply impressed him and re-echoed in his soul as well as in his preaching. I mean that the differences in the thought-world of the oracles of the Book of Deutero-Isaiah depend on the vicissitudes of the course of historical events in the age in which he lived.

Our next task must consequently be quite summarily to recall the most important occurrences in the East in the middle of the sixth century B.C.[29]

Cyrus appears in history 558 B. C. or so as king of the inconsiderable province Anshan, whose geographical situation and relation to the country of Parsu are alike uncertain. He was a vassal of the king of Media. He rebelled against Astyages, the king of the Medes. Astyages was taken prisoner and Ecbatana captured in 550/49. The treasures of Ecbatana were transferred to Anshan. The kingdom of Media was preserved, but received a new dynasty, the house of Achaemenes. In 547 we find Cyrus in the north of Mesopotamia, whence he attacked Lydia, the kingdom of Croesus. Cyrus defeated Croesus and conquered his capital Sardis. Then followed the occupation of the cities and provinces on the coasts of Asia Minor and of several Greek islands. The following years were devoted to the quelling of rebellions in the eastern parts of the empire.

[29] The following brief sketch is based on *The Cambridge Ancient History*, 4, 1930, pp. 2—15, A. T. Olmstead, *History of the Persian Empire*, Chicago 1948, pp. 34—58, and S. Smith, *Isaiah Chapters XL—LV*, pp. 24—48.

In the years 540/39 it was Babylonia's turn. In 540 Cyrus opened his Babylonian campaign. He had previously won over to his side Gobryas, the governor of the province of Gutium. The Persian armies marched from victory to victory along the Tigris from the north towards Babylon. Gobryas marched unopposed into Babylon. Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, was taken prisoner before he had time to escape. A little later, on October 29, Cyrus himself entered the city in a quite peaceful manner, welcomed by a large part of the population. Cyrus spared the city and showed its habitants clemency. The temples and the cults were preserved and restored, the idols which Nabonidus, apparently in fear of the approaching conqueror, had brought to Babylon from other cities were carried back with all due honour. Babylon became one of the many capitals of the Persian king. Cyrus paid honour to Marduk, the principal god of Babylon, in gratitude for his victories, worshipped him as the god who had called him to lordship over the entire world, and took over the kingdom of Babylonia as a favour from Marduk. Marduk rejoiced and looked with favour on Cyrus' kingdom; and his rule was loved by Bel and Nabu.

In 538 the Jews received permission to return to Palestine and rebuild the Temple. The utensils of the Jewish Temple, brought to Babylonia by Nebuchadnezzar, were restored to their place. But the company that followed Sheshbazzar, the newly-appointed governor of Judah, was inconsiderable; and Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine were joined to Babylonia in one huge satrapy.

In a paper read at the meeting of Old Testament sholars in Goettingen in 1935[30] Professor W. B. Stevenson vigorously maintained that the contents and character of the public utterances of Deutero-Isaiah were largely determined by the particular historical circumstances contemporary with the prophet, and that, consequently, the career of Cyrus to a large extent must be made the basis of the dating of the revelations in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah as we now have it. Stevenson laid special stress upon the Persian occupation of Babylon in October 539 B. C. as a sort of a watershed within the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah. He distinguished between utterances preceding and utterances following that event.

Professor Stevenson was right in clearly recognizing the intimate parallelism between the course of historical events and the prophetic career of Deutero-Isaiah; but in practice his attempt to date the different passages could not be entirely successful, because he excluded the Ser-

[30] 'Successive Phases in the Career of the Babylonian Isaiah', printed in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments* (Beih. z. ZAW, 66, 1936, pp. 89—96).

vant Songs from his examination on principle, and did not recognize sufficiently clearly the important variations in the religious message of Deutero-Isaiah. We find in his paper, for instance, no account taken of Deutero-Isaiah's conception of the Gentiles and their future. I am, therefore, unable to follow Stevenson in detail, although I fully appreciate his main contention.[31]

Another noteworthy attempt to fit the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah into the course of contemporary historical events was made by J. Begrich in his *Studien zu Deuterojesaja*. In these Studies Begrich distinguishes three periods in the prophetic career of Deutero-Isaiah. The first period extends from the appearance of Cyrus as a rebel against the king of Media in 553/2 B. C. (according to Begrich's chronology) to his final occupation of the throne of the Medes in 550/49. To this epoch belong, according to Begrich, a number of oracles called by him 'eschatologische Texte' — in part identical with my general 'triumphal revelations' —, evoked by the revolutionary occurrences in the remote southern parts of the vast Median kingdom, and full of traditional eschatological ideas, but without any distinct references to actual history. After 549 followed, says Begrich, some years of relative calm until the beginning of the attack against Lydia in 547/6. Those were years of uncertainty and questioning, and this is reflected in a small number of oracles, such as LV.8—13. The third period began with the downfall of the Lydian kingdom and ended a short time after this event. The oracles deriving from this epoch are

[31] Professor Stevenson was of course not the first to relate the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah to the different stages of the historical development of his time. In 1913 W. Staerk in *Die Ebed Jahwe-lieder* (pp. 79—102) had made a noteworthy attempt of a similar kind. He, too, held that the downfall of Babylon formed the line of demarcation in the prophecy of Deutero-Isaiah. He divided the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah, like several scholars in his time, into two principal groups, chs. XL—XLVIII and XLIX—LV. In the first group Cyrus plays a principal rôle; in the second group Cyrus entirely disappears. Staerk's theory is untenable because it is quite impracticable, in the light of more recent research, to make a division along that line. The two groups are entirely illusory, 'the Cyrus revelations' in a wider sense being spread out over the whole book. Staerk's view is essentially dependent on the erroneous view that 'Deutero-Isaiah' was from the first a book in the literary sense rather than a collection of separate oracles more or less loosely combined. The division of the oracles of Deutero-Isaiah into two main groups, chs. XL—XLVIII and XLIX—LV, is to be found also in modern works such as the Introductions of Oesterley-Robinson and R. H. Pfeiffer (*Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York & London 1941). Among those scholars who have emphasized the importance of the events which took place circa 539 for the message of the Second Isaiah, particular mention should be made of Hempel. See, e.g., his article 'Vom irrenden Glauben', cited above. Compare Smith and Irwin, *The Prophets and their Times*, pp. 217—240.

in part identical with those which were described above as the Cyrus revelations. The occupation of Babylon by the Persian armies in 539 has not left any traces in the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah. His activities were ended some years before that event, perhaps shortly after 546.

As to the Ebed-Yahweh Songs, Begrich thinks that they refer to the prophet himself, and that they are to be spread out over all periods of the prophet's career. The prophet's conception of the future of the Gentiles is likewise constant through the different periods: first catastrophe, then conversion of the survivors.

To this view several objections might be made. It is not likely that the rather obscure occurrences on the southern frontiers of the Median kingdom evoked any expectations at all in the prophet's soul. That an insignificant vassal of the mighty king of Media began to rebel against his sovereign was surely nothing unusual and startling. The *general* sense of the 'eschatological', or 'triumphal revelations' is adequately explained by the prophet's confidence in the certainty of the prospects and promises preserved in the prophetic traditions of Israel. On the other hand Begrich is right in his statement that the bulk of the Cyrus oracles belong to the period dominated by the effect of the overthrow of the Lydian kingdom. As to Begrich's second period, it surely cannot be described as a period of calm and uncertainty: it prepared and led up to the great Lydian campaign. As for the Ebed-Yahweh Songs, it must be said that Begrich obviously is mistaken about their meaning and their importance in the thought world of Deutero-Isaiah, as will be quite manifest to anyone who adopts the analysis given above. The Ebed-Yahweh oracles represent a cycle of ideas so characteristic, so homogeneous, so important that they cannot be understood apart from experiences of vital importance in the life of the prophet and his people. It is curious that Begrich, like many other scholars, has not observed the fundamental diversity in the prophet's attitude to the Gentiles in different utterances. The picture of the Gentiles as objects of the most cruel vengeance and as future slaves of the Israelites, licking the dust of their feet, and the picture of the Gentiles as waiting for the *tôrâh* of Yahweh and destined for conversion and salvation cannot be combined into an organic unity such as Begrich assumes. The different views must depend on a profound transformation in the prophet's own outlook brought about by a radical change in the historical situation.

The principal reason for my opinion that Begrich's construction cannot be regarded as successful is that he has not satisfactorily understood the significance of the Ebed-Yahweh oracles, which, it seems to me, must either be eliminated from the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah, or else treated

as a corner-stone in every attempt to classify his oracles and arrange them chronologically.[32]

In presenting my own opinion concerning the date of the different groups of oracles, I may take as my starting-point some sound remarks made by Professor North concerning the historical background of the Servant Songs. Professor North says, 'The Songs are quite evidently born of an intense anguish of soul, anguish such as the Prophet must have experienced when Cyrus, whom he had expected to be a kind of first-fruits of Yahwism among the Gentiles, proclaimed instead his enthusiasm for Bel-Marduk.... It is clear, in any case, that the glowing expectations of the Prophet in his early ministry were very inadequately realized. The fall of Babylon did not usher in the golden age, but a time of disillusionment and hopes deferred.'[33] I am in entire agreement with Professor North on this point. The year 539 is to be regarded as an important watershed in the preaching of Deutero-Isaiah. But it is possible to go farther.

It can be maintained with certainty that those oracles which refer to Cyrus in express terms must have originated in the period after Cyrus began his far-reaching political and military enterprises. The prophet, following from his Babylonian watch-tower the course of contemporary history, became fascinated by the astonishing success of Cyrus. This was no mere human achievement. He saw in the victorious progress of Cyrus a mighty act of Yahweh, the Lord of history, and joined to his person the fulfilment of the prophetic promises and the hope of deliverance for the exiles. He gave in his utterances vivid descriptions of the appearance and victories of Cyrus. Unexpectedly he arose in the east — he is called a bird of prey from the east, from a far land[34]—; before him Yahweh tramples the nations, opens the portals, shatters the doors of bronze. He gives him the treasures of darkness, the hoards long hidden in secret (we think here of the treasures of Ecbatana transferred to Anshan).[35] He vanquishes nations and treads kings under foot. He pursues them and passes on safely. He treads no path with his feet[36]. We recognize in this description the miraculous victories of Cyrus from the occupation of the Median throne to the Lydian campaign and from

---

[32] Very interesting remarks on *direct* references to contemporary events in various passages of Deutero-Isaiah are to be found in S. Smith, *Isaiah Chapters XL—LV*, pp. 49—75. Some of them, however, are not convincing.

[33] *Op. cit.*, p. 217. Cf. recently Buber, *op. cit.*, pp. 219ff.

[34] XLVI.11

[35] XLV.1ff.

[36] XLI.2ff.

the defeat of Croesus to the subduing of the coast lands of Asia Minor and so on.

To this period we must assign both the Cyrus oracles in the strict sense and also those oracles which do not expressly mention his name, but depict the deliverance as immediately approaching. The prophet sees as in a vision the deliverance and the return of the exiles to Palestine as a historical fact now about to be achieved. The idols of Babylon are overthrown. The city is destroyed. Zion is summoned to prepare itself for the receiving of its children. Yahweh burns with eagerness to accomplish his work.[37]

The prophet's message concerning Cyrus as the unexpected deliverer and the instrument of Yahweh filled the majority of the exiles with hope and joy. But there were also those who did not consider Cyrus as a worthy servant of Yahweh, pagan tyrant, as he was, and declined to regard him as a fulfiller of the promises. These people were blamed by the prophet, who set before them the foolishness of criticizing Yahweh's conduct and doings. This is the background of a denunciatory utterance such as XLV.9ff.: the clay does not criticize the potter, nor the child its parents; equally foolish is it when Israel critizes its God.

The *terminus ad quem* for those revelations which group themselves about Cyrus and his victorious progress is the occupation of Babylon. That event must certainly have put an end to the expectations of the people concerning the total destruction of Babylon and the triumphal return; for what really happened in connection with the occupation of Babylon fell short of what was expected both by the prophet himself and by his compatriots. What was hoped for is shown by passages such as XLVI.1—2, XLVII.1—15 and so on. Babylon would be taken by force and suffer the same fate as all enemy cities taken in war. It would be levelled with the ground and emptied of habitants. Its idols would be overthrown and carried away. Nothing like that really happened. Cyrus proceeded with great clemency and indulgence towards Babylon after the entirely peaceful occupation. There was no destruction, no attack against its religion and its cult. The idols, derided by the prophet, were respected by the conqueror and preserved in their places. The principal god of Babylon was worshipped by Cyrus as his Lord and divine Helper.

With the occupation of Babylon the triumphal tone of the prophet must have died away. All splendid prospects must suddenly have faded. We know, it is true, that after the fall of the Babylonian empire the Jews were permitted by Cyrus to return to Palestine, but, as has often been

[37] Cf. above, p. 65.

pointed out, the return was carried out on a much smaller scale and in much more modest forms than the prophecies had promised.

The expectations of the destruction of Babylon and the triumph of Israel having been reduced to dust, the prophet must look for new revelations from his God, explaining the altered situation and showing new ways for the accomplishing of God's plans with regard to Israel. These new revelations did not fail to come. Israel had a still higher aim than triumph and national splendour. Israel had been given a missionary task, the task of being an instrument in Yahweh's hand for the conversion and salvation of the Gentiles. That task should be performed through witnessing to Yahweh and His *tôrâh* and through suffering for the benefit of the Gentiles. As we have seen, these thoughts dominate 'the missionary revelations' of Deutero-Isaiah, culminating in the Ebed-Yahweh oracles.

In this way a very appropriate place for those revelations can be found within the prophetic career of Deutero-Isaiah.

Of course there remains one difficulty: how to combine, not only chronologically, but also organically, the two apparently inconsistent ideas: the idea of the triumph over the Gentiles on one side and the idea of the missionary task on the other? This question is a psychological, or a theological one. I think the prophet himself saw the solution in the incomprehensibility for the human mind of the ways of God. God had possibilities of connecting the two prospects in one unity. Another problem is this: what made the disciples of Deutero-Isaiah preserve the two groups of oracles side by side in the oral, or written, tradition? I think they regarded all of them as God's word and therefore inviolable, and they had, further, the expedient of interpreting them in such a manner that the inconsistencies fell away. In later times the solution of the problem was found in the eschatological Messianic interpretation of the Ebed-Yahweh Songs.[38]

There remain still a number of passages in the Book of Deutero-Isaiah which belong neither to the 'Cyrus revelations' nor to the 'missionary revelations'.[39] I mean those passages in which the deliverance and the return are predicted, but in terms which exclude the acknowledgement of Cyrus and the remarkable historical occurrences in his time. They are 'triumphal revelations', but in an entirely general sense, without any connection at all with real history. The hope of the deliverance and re-establishment of the Jewish nation in Palestine is founded only on Yah-

[38] For this and similar theological problems see especially Hempel, 'Vom irrenden Glauben', and V. Herntrich, 'Gottes Knecht und Gottes Reich nach Jesaja 40—55', *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*, 16, 1939, pp. 132—170.

[39] Cf. above, p. 65.

weh's promises, on the election of Israel, on Yahweh's power and good will, and on the conviction that the penalty has fully been paid. These passages must belong to the time before the appearance of Cyrus on the scene of world-history. That the unknown prophet was active among the exiles before about 550, is very probable. It is obvious that the messages of the prophet must have had a different tone after the appearance of Cyrus, just as the oracles uttered after the occupation of Babylon must have had another character than those which were evoked by the triumphal progress of Cyrus.

Chapter IV.

The Use of Figurative Language in Deutero-Isaiah.

In the previous chapter I have tried to show that the ideas of the Ebed-Yahweh oracles fit very well into the career of Deutero-Isaiah as a whole. In this chapter I propose to examine whether the symbolic mode of expression in these oracles accords with the style of the Deutero-Isaianic revelations in general.

The Book of Deutero-Isaiah abounds in figures and similes more than most Old Testament books. The whole grandeur of oriental imagery is here displayed.

The style of Deutero-Isaiah has, of course, been examined and discussed by other writers. Begrich in his *Studien* deals admittedly with stylistic questions, but he is essentially interested in the literary categories ('Gattungen') used by the prophet. In his book *Deuterojesaja, stilkritisch untersucht* L. Köhler analyses many stylistic peculiarities in Deutero-Isaiah, but does not by any means render superfluous a special examination of the metaphors, similes, parables and the like. We are indebted to Köhler for many valuable observations: Deutero-Isaiah was an artist consciously striving for stylistic effect; his style can be appropriately characterized as rhetorical; it is 'voluminous' rather than concentrated or pointed, and so on; but what is still lacking is an attempt to systematize the figurative expressions in Deutero-Isaiah and to use the results of such an examination for the better understanding of the ideas which the prophet presented in his oracles.

It is to this task that we now turn.

The figurative expressions in Deutero-Isaiah can be appropriately classified as follows. There are firstly a great many single metaphors, secondly metaphorical descriptions, thirdly comparisons, lastly a number of parables.

The German scholar Adolf Jülicher in the introduction to his epoch-making work *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*[1] ingeniously characterized differ-

[1] Erster Teil. Zweite, neu bearbeitete Auflage, Tübingen 1910.

ent forms of figurative language. According to Jülicher the characteristic of a metaphor is that it consists of a word for which another word, in some measure akin to it, is to be substituted if the proper sense of the sentence is to be made plain. A metaphor is formed through avoiding the ordinary word, which first comes to hand, and choosing a word belonging to another sphere, but with a certain affinity to the word avoided. The metaphor is the basic form of figurative language. When a metaphor is used, something else is always referred to: one thing is said, another is meant.[2]

The Swedish philologist A. Wifstrand, who simply characterizes the metaphor as an imaginative expression, used instead of the normal one, rightly observes that Greek poetry abounds in metaphors, while Greek prose is very sparing of them. In Greek the majority of metaphors are expressed by verbs and refer to action, while in modern speech metaphors are, at least as frequently, expressed by nouns.[3]

It is often said that metaphors are used to give vivid expression to abstract ideas.[4] As far as the Old Testament is concerned, this is not true as a general statement. There one concrete idea is very often substituted for another concrete idea in order to depict the character of the latter more vividly. When Yahweh in Deutero-Isaiah says, alluding to Cyrus, 'I call from the east a bird of prey',[5] the idea covered by the metaphor is of course as concrete as the metaphor itself. What is highly important is that the metaphors are used not only to unfold the meaning of the primary idea, but very often to increase its emotional content. The metaphor, it has been pointed out, is very often used to heighten 'emotional expressiveness'.[6] That is especially true of the literature of the Old Testament. The Hebrews laid more stress on emphasis than on clearness. The authors and speakers of the Old Testament were intent on putting their souls into their words, on concentrating in the ex-

---

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 52—58.

[3] *Tider och stilar*, Lund 1944, p. 19f.

[4] See, e.g., L. Arbusow, *Colores rhetorici*, Göttingen 1948, p. 83.

[5] XLVI.11. Engnell draws attention to the fact that in the Ancient Near East the eagle was a frequent symbol of the king, *op. cit.*, p. 68, n. 4. Properly the Hebrew word signifies, however, bird of prey in general.

[6] R. Pipping, *Uttrycksbehov och stilarter* (Acta Academiae Aboensis, Hum., III,8), Åbo 1922, p. 4. So also W. Kayser, *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk. Eine Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*, Bern 1948, p. 126: 'Die Metapher ist eines der wirksamsten Mittel, den Bedeutungsraum zu weitern und den Aufnehmenden in Bewegung zu setzen. Zugleich wird gerade an der Metapher deutlich, dass es nicht auf die Bedeutung ankommt, sondern dass gefühlsmässige Wirkungen und Nebenvorstellungen aller Art beteiligt sind.'

pressions they used the greatest possible measure of vigour, energy, pathos. This aim is achieved through repetition and reiteration — the rhythmical parallelism in Hebrew poetry depends in part on the striving for dynamic effect —, but also by means of the 'emotional expressiveness' of the words chosen by the speaker or the author. He who wanted to gain and hold men's attention had to be able to hit upon attractive and fascinating words, and he had to know how to drive his meaning home by emphatic and varied repetition.[7]

In his masterly use of *metaphor*, Deutero-Isaiah aims particularly at producing 'emotional expressiveness'.

When he calls Cyrus a bird of prey from the east, his aim is not to give a lucid account of Cyrus' policy, but to give his hearers a vivid impression of the aggressive, rapacious, fear-inspiring advance of the Persian king.

Furthermore he says of Cyrus: he does not tread any path with his feet; his victorious progress is marvellously rapid and unhindered.[8] He tramples on princes; he subjugates them with disdain.[9] Yahweh holds his right hand; Yahweh supports him in his achievements.[10] Yahweh has girded him (a ritual term); He has commissioned and endowed him for his task.[11] Yahweh makes straight all his ways; Yahweh gives him success and victory.[12]

Babylonia is called the mistress or queen of kingdoms, a tender and delicate lady. She will be bereaved of children and husband; she will be totally destroyed and emptied of inhabitants.[13] The idolaters have besmeared eyes and hearts; they are without understanding.[14] The adversaries will be devoured by the moth and the worm; they will perish contemptibly.[15]

Israel's captivity and distress are called a warfare.[16] The exiles lie on the ground, bowed, chained, and fainting. The enemies pass over their

---

[7] Cf. J. Lindblom, *Boken om Job och hans lidande*, Lund 1940, p. 73f.; *La composition du livre de Job* (Bulletin de la société royale des lettres de Lund 1944—45, III), Lund 1945, pp. 40ff. See also J. Pedersen, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I—II, London and Copenhagen 1926, pp. 123ff.

[8] XLI.3

[9] XLI.25

[10] XLV.1

[11] XLV.5

[12] XLV.13

[13] XLVII.1—9

[14] XLIV.18

[15] LI.8

[16] XL.2

bodies.[17] Babylon has made its yoke heavy upon them.[18] They live in darkness seeing no light (darkness is here, as often in the Old Testament, a metaphor for distress, light for welfare).[19] Israel is intoxicated, made drunk; it is an object of the wrath of Yahweh.[20] It is scorched and burned round about;[21] it is tempest-tossed, that is, tormented and afflicted in every respect.[22] It is addressed as 'thou worm Jacob', helpless, miserable, despised as it is. The people seek water in vain; their tongue is parched with thirst.[23] Their land is a woman who has lost her children. Israel itself bears the reproach of widowhood.[24] The exiles are blind and deaf; they do not understand their own situation or Yahweh's plans.[25] Israel's neck is an iron bar; its forehead is brass, i.e., it is stubborn, stiff-necked, and obstinate.[26] Its name, however, is graven on Yahweh's palms; Yahweh will never forget His people. Yahweh takes it by the hand and makes it the light of nations. Supported by Yahweh Israel will be an instrument of welfare and salvation to the Gentiles.[27] (It is likewise said of the servant-prophet, and also of the *tôrâh*, that they will be the light of the nations.[28]) The rock whence they were hewn, the quarry whence they were digged are metaphors for the ancestry of the Israelite people.[29] Israel is so valuable in the eyes of its God that He gives Egypt, Ethiopia, and Seba in ransom for it.[30]

---

[17] LI.14,23

[18] XLVII.6

[19] XLIX.9, L.10

[20] LI.21ff. 'Intoxication' is in the Old Testament often a metaphor for a state of a miraculous, mysterious panic regarded as an effect of the divine wrath. G. Widengren in *Religion och bibel. Nathan Söderblomsällskapets årsbok*, 7, 1948, p. 44, n. 3, connects the idea of intoxication with the 'chaos-state' of the Tammuz-myth. But he admits himself that this idea has not yet been found in the Tammuz-texts.

[21] XLII.25

[22] LIV.11

[23] XLI.14, 17

[24] XLIX.20, LIV.4

[25] XLII.16,18,19, XLIII.8

[26] XLVIII.4

[27] XLIX.16, XLII.6

[28] XLIX.6, LI.4

[29] LI.1. It is likely that the expressions here used metaphorically utimately derive their origin from the primitive and wide-spread mythological idea of the earth as mother of all living; cf. Deut. XXXII.18, Job I.21, Ps. CXXXIX.15, Jer. II.27, Ecclus. XL.1f.

[30] XLIII.3—4. The expressions are purely metaphorical. It is pointless to look for precise historical references.

All flesh is grass; men are but creatures of a day.[31] The fates of men and their activities are called their ways. A righteous conduct is called the right path.[32] The earliest history of a nation is called its youth.[33] A king is called shepherd.[34] By metonymy a speaker is called a tongue.[35] Of the Servant of Yahweh it is said that he will not faint or be crushed.[36] The result of the labours of the suffering servant, the saved Gentiles, will be an abundant spoil allotted to him.[37]

There are many references to the arm and hand of Yahweh. The hand of Yahweh brings salvation. Yahweh reveals and bares His arm; nobody can rescue from His hand; His arm is not too short; the far islands and coasts are waiting for His arm. The arm awakes and puts on strength. Yahweh's hand has created the world and governs the nations. His hand conceals and protects His servant. Thus, the arm and hand are metaphors for Yahweh's power, manifested in creation and in history, particularly in the preservation of Israel, the chosen people, and its release from Babylonia.[38] It is further said of Yahweh that He stretches forth and spreads out the heavens. He makes firm the earth.[39] He commands the host of the heavens.[40] He pours out his wrath.[41] He is a rock, i.e., He exists eternally and is immutable and trustworthy.[42] He is the spouse of Israel.[43] Yahweh's 'ways' is a metaphor for what Yahweh wills, what He thinks, does, and plans.[44]

So much for the metaphors in Deutero-Isaiah. We also find what may be called *metaphorical descriptions*, which can be distinguished from the metaphors in that they consist of series of figurative words and expressions put together to form descriptions which are more or less consistent, the aim being to depict a sequence of events. Jülicher in his above-mentioned work has rightly observed and described this

---

[31] XL.6—8
[32] XL.14,27, XLVIII.17
[33] XLVII.15
[34] XLIV.28
[35] LIV.17
[36] XLII.4
[37] LIII.12
[38] XL.10, XLI.10,20, XLIII.13, XLV.12, XLVIII.13, L.2, LI.5,9,16, LII.10, LIII.1
[39] XL.22, XLII.5, XLIV.24, XLV.12, XLVIII.13, LI.13 etc.
[40] XLV.12
[41] XLII.25
[42] XLIV.8
[43] LIV.5
[44] XLII.24, LV.8

kind of figurative language.[45] He speaks of 'eine von Metaphern durchsetzte Rede'. As an example from the Gospels he adduces the narrative of the good shepherd in John X, very often inadequately named a parable. There is mention here of a sheep-fold with a door, a true shepherd, thieves and robbers not entering by the door, but climbing some other way, a porter opening the door, who calls the sheep by name and leads them out. The sheep follow him and hear his voice. Then follows an interpretation. Jesus is the door. Whoever enters in by Him shall be saved. But He is also the good shepherd, who gives His life for the sheep. He knows His sheep and His sheep know Him. The hireling flees when he sees the wolf coming, and so on. Such a narrative approximates to an allegory but is devoid of the unity and consistency characteristic of a real allegory. Allegorical words and expressions, not always coherent one with another, are mingled with elements belonging to the reality which was to be depicted. All that is typical of the kind of figurative expression which here is called 'metaphorical description'.

In Deutero-Isaiah there are many examples of 'metaphorical description'. The omnipotence and majesty of the Creator are often described by a series of impressive metaphors. He measures the waters in the hollow of His hand and metes out the heavens with a span. He comprehends the dust of the earth in a measure, and weighs the mountains in scales and the hills in a balance.[46] He sits above the circle of the earth, and its inhabitants are like locusts, He stretches out the heavens like a veil, and spreads them out like a tent to dwell in. He brings princes to nothing, and makes the rulers of the earth as naught. They are scarcely planted, scarcely sown, their stem has hardly struck root in the ground — when He blows upon them they wither; the tempest carries them off like stubble.[47] He brings out the host of the stars by number, calling each by his name; not one is missing.[48] He clothes the heavens with darkness; He makes sackcloth their covering.[49]

Yahweh's action for the deliverance of Israel from Babylonia and its return to Palestine is often described in a similar series of metaphors. He brings with Him His reward. Like a shepherd He tends His flock, gathering them with His arm. He carries the lambs in His bosom; He gently leads the ewes that give suck.[50] He goes forth like a hero; He

---

[45] *Op. cit.*, p. 115.
[46] XL.12
[47] XL.22—24
[48] XL.26
[49] L.3
[50] XL.10—11

stirs up His zeal like a warrior. He shouts aloud and gives a battle-cry and does valiantly against His foes. He cries out like a woman in travail; He gasps and pants (i.e. He is eager at last to perform His work).[51] He pours water on the thirsty ground, and streams on the dry land. The descendants of Israel will sprout like plants in an oasis and like poplars beside the water-courses. One will say: I am Yahweh's; and another will call himself by the name of Jacob; the third will inscribe on his hand: 'Yahweh's', and will surname himself by the name of Israel (i.e., the idea of election will be realized in cultural as well as religious conditions).[52] Yahweh lifts up His hand and raises His signal to the nations; and they bring the sons and daughters of Israel in their bosoms and on their shoulders. Kings will be their guardians, queens their nursing-mothers.[53] Yahweh makes Israel a new threshing-sledge armed with teeth; it will thresh the mountains and make the hills like chaff. They will be winnowed; and the wind will carry them off and the tempest scatter them (through the power of Yahweh Israel will remove all obstacles in its way and take vengeance on its adversaries).[54] Yahweh will rescue the Israelites from all dangers: if they pass through water, He will be with them; and rivers will not overwhelm them. If they walk through fire, they will not be scorched; and the flames will not burn them.[55] Yahweh has borne His people from infancy, carried it from the womb; even unto grey hairs He will carry it (Yahweh has always taken care of His beloved people and will never cease to do so).[56] Yahweh has not dismissed Israel's mother by means of a bill of divorcement. He has not sold them as slaves to any creditor.[57] The people has been sold for no price; without money it will be redeemed (Yahweh has not finally cast off His people, nor has He been forced to abandon it; thus Yahweh is quite at liberty to take the exiles out from Babylonia whenever He will).[58] Those who hope in Yahweh will mount up on pinions like eagles. They will run and not be weary; they will not faint as they journey on (they will renew their might).[59] Yahweh has made Cyrus an instrument to perform His plans,

[51] XLII.13—14. For the metaphorical war motives see H. Fredriksson, *Jahwe als Krieger. Studien zum alttestamentlichen Gottesbild*, Lund 1945.

[52] XLIV.3—5. For the prep. *l* in this connection see recently H. Cazelles in *Revue biblique*, 1949, pp. 93—101. For the explanation of v. 4a see J. Lindblom in *Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift*, 26, 1950, p. 309.

[53] XLIX.22—23

[54] XLI.15—16

[55] XLIII.2

[56] XLVI.3—4

[57] L.1

[58] LII.3, cf. XLV.13

[59] XL.31

and the success of the Persian king is described in impressive metaphors: He tramples down nations before him and looses the loins of kings. The portals open for him; the gates cannot remain closed. Yahweh makes straight his ways, shatters the doors of bronze, sunders the bolts of iron.[60]

Israel will open blind eyes, release prisoners, and bring out from the dungeon those who sit in darkness.[61] Jerusalem will enjoy freedom, it will be glorified and inhabited as before. Those ideas are depicted by means of a series of impressive figures: Jerusalem is summoned to get up on a high mountain, to lift up her voice with might, and announce like a herald to the cities of Judah that Yahweh is coming to His land at the head of the returning exiles.[62] When seeing the returning crowds she will ask: Who has given birth to these? I was childless and barren: who has reared up these? I was left alone: these, then, whence are they?[63] Jerusalem will put on her glorious garments; she will arise, shake off the dust, free her neck from the bonds.[64] The barren one who has not borne, she who has not travailed, is now summoned to sing and cry aloud, because the children of the desolate have become more numerous than the children of the espoused. Zion will enlarge the place of her tent, extend the curtains of her dwelling, lengthen the tent-ropes, make strong the tent-pegs.[65] Jerusalem will be restored in splendour; it will be built up with precious stones.[66] Yahweh invites His people to listen to the message of the new covenant in these figurative sentences: everyone that is thirsty, come to get water; come and buy corn without money, and wine and milk without cost. If you hearken to me, you will eat what is good, and your soul will delight in fatness.[67]

The fate of Babylon is described in a fanciful series of metaphors. The virgin daughter of Babylon must descend, and sit on the ground, dethroned. She must take the mill-stones and grind meal, remove the veil, strip off her train, make bare her legs, pass through streams. She will sit in silence and go into the darkness.[68] Yahweh will take the cup of intoxication from the hand of Israel and place it in the hand of the

---

[60] XLV.1—3
[61] XLII.7
[62] XL.9
[63] XLIX.21
[64] LII.1—2
[65] LIV.1—2
[66] LIV.11—12. S. Smith says on this passage, 'It seems possible that this is the earliest description of floor mosaics, previously unknown in Palestine', *op. cit.*, p. 166.
[67] LV.1—2
[68] XLVII.1—5

oppressors.[69] He will make the oppressors eat their own flesh and be drunk with their own blood as with wine.[70] All who are kindling a fire and lighting fire-arrows (?) will come into the flame of their fire and be struck by the fire-arrows which they have kindled(?).[71]

Israel in its present state is described as a people robbed and spoiled, ensnared in holes (?), hid in prisons. They have become a spoil, with none to deliver, a prey, and none to say: 'Restore'[72] It has been refined; it has been tested in the furnace of affliction, but has not given silver as result.[73] Jerusalem has drunk from Yahweh's hand the cup of His wrath, the goblet of intoxication she has drained to the dregs. She was like an old woman that had none to guide her of all the sons she had borne; she had none to take her hand of all the sons she had reared.[74]

Of the servant-prophet it is said that Yahweh made his mouth like a sharp sword, and hid him in the shadow of his hand. He made him a polished arrow, and kept him in His quiver.[75] He gave his back to the smiters, his cheek to them that plucked his beard; and he made his face like flint.[76] In the first Song it is said of the servant's work among men that he does not break a bruised reed, and he does not quench a dim wick (i.e., he does not maltreat the weak and defenceless).[77]

A special example of metaphorical description is the figure of a civil action or of a criminal trial, often used by Deutero-Isaiah. A fine analysis of the different elements belonging to this figure is given by J. Begrich in his book mentioned above.[78] The main passages are: XLI.1—5, 21—29, XLIII.8—13,22—28, XLIV.6—8, XLVIII.1—11, L.1—2,8—9. We are here told of legal proceedings, citing before a court, ligitants, prosecutors, defendant, indictment, defence, witnesses, advocates, judges, testimonies, judgment, and punishment, and so on. Since Begrich gives an exhaustive account of this, it is unnecessary to cover the same ground again here.

In addition to the single metaphors and the metaphorical descriptions, there are in Deutero-Isaiah also numbers of *comparisons*. The comparisons are partly direct, partly indirect. In the first category the

[69] LI.22—23
[70] XLIX.26
[71] L.11
[72] XLII.22
[73] XLVIII.10
[74] LI.17—18
[75] XLIX.2
[76] L.6—7
[77] XLII.3. Cf. above, pp. 16f.
[78] *Op. cit.*, pp. 19—42; cf. Köhler, *op. cit.*, pp. 110—120.

two *membra comparationis* are connected by 'as' ,'like', 'counted as' and so on. In the indirect comparisons such words and particles of connective nature are missing. The *membra* stand side by side, and the reader must find out himself that a comparison is intended, which is generally easy enough. In Deutero-Isaiah the majority of the indirect comparisons are antithetic, i.e., the one member is positive in content, the other negative. The one member expresses the converse of what is stated by the other.

Direct comparisons. It is said of mankind: all its glory is like the flower of the field (*tertium comparationis* instability, transience). The nations are like a drop from a bucket; they are counted as the dust on a balance (*t.c.* slightness, insignificance). God lifts up the islands like fine dust. All the nations are as nothing before Him; they are counted as *tōhû* to Him. The inhabitants of the earth are like locusts before Him who sits above the circle of the earth (*t.c.* smallness and fragility). God stretches out the heavens as a veil and spreads them like a tent. He makes the rulers of the world like *tōhû*.[79] Those who hope in Yahweh will mount on pinions like eagles.[80] Yahweh cries out, gasps and pants, like a woman in travail.[81] He goes forth like a hero. Like a warrior He stirs up His zeal.[82] He blots out transgressions as a mist and sins as a cloud.[83] As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are Yahweh's ways higher than the ways of men.[84] Men who do not hold the true faith have gone astray like sheep.[85] The heavens vanish like smoke and the earth wears out like a garment. Men die like gnats, they are extinguished like a wick.[86]

The exiles are like antelopes entrapped (*t.c.* misery, impotence). Their back has been made like the ground, like the streets for the enemies to traverse.[87] Israel in its distress is like a woman forsaken and sad in spirit.[88]

Before Cyrus the sword of the enemy is made like dust, his bow like driven stubble. Cyrus tramples on governors like mire, and is like the potter treading clay.[89]

[79] XL.6—23. For XL.15 see H. Torczyner, *Studia theologica*, I, 1948, pp. 195f., and II, 1949, p. 98.

[80] XL.31

[81] XLII.14

[82] XLII.13

[83] XLIV.22

[84] LV.9

[85] LIII.6

[86] LI.6, XLIII.17. The real sense of כמו כן in LI.6 is debatable. Cf. the original suggestion of J. Reider, *ZAW*, 53, 1935, pp. 270f.

[87] LI.20,23

[88] LIV.6

[89] XLI.2,25. For the term סגנים see J. van der Ploeg in *Revue biblique*, 1950, pp.51f.

The astrologers of Babylon will be like stubble, which the fire consumes.[90] Oppressors and enemies will be drunk with their own blood as with new wine (*t.c.* panic, dizziness). They will all wear out like a garment. They are like a garment eaten by the moth, like wool eaten by the worm. Israel will make the hills like chaff.[91]

Israel's welfare will be like a river and its salvation like the waves of the sea. Its seed will be like the sand, and sprout like poplars beside the water-courses.[92] Zion will don her children like an ornament; she will gird them on like a bride adorning herself (*t.c.* glory, splendour, pride)[93]. Yahweh will make the wilderness of Judah like Eden, her desert like the garden of the Lord.[94]

Yahweh made the mouth of His servant, the prophet, like a sharp sword (*t.c.* wounding, piercing, killing).[95] The servant made his face like flint.[96] The suffering servant grew up like a sapling, like a root from arid land (*t.c.* miserable appearance in a poor *milieu*). He is like a lamb that is lead to the slaughter, and like a ewe that is dumb before its shearers.[97]

Indirect antithetic comparisons. The heavens will vanish like smoke, and the earth wear out like a garment — Yahweh's salvation abides for ever.[98] The moth will eat the adversaries like a garment, and the worm will eat them like wool — Yahweh's saving righteousness will be for ever.[99] The mountains will move, and the hills be shaken — Yahweh's mercy will not depart from His people; His covenant of peace will not be shaken.[100]

Parables. In the Gospels a great many parables are used to illustrate the kingdom of God and other ideas of the new covenant. Deutero-Isaiah likewise makes use of parables which may be regarded as analogous to those of the New Testament. A parable is a narrative taken from nature or human life, which serves to throw light upon an essential point or perhaps a few essential points in something which belongs to another sphere, usually to the spiritual sphere. The parable, however short it may be, differs from the metaphorical description by its con-

---

[90] XLVII.14
[91] XLIX.26, L.9, LI.8, XLI.15
[92] XLVIII.18—19, XLIV.4
[93] XLIX.18
[94] LI.3
[95] XLIX.2
[96] L.7
[97] LIII.2,7
[98] LI.6
[99] LI.8
[100] LIV.10

sistency and narrative coherence, such as we miss in the metaphorical description with its series of often disparate figures. In the parable every single element is precisely what the word indicates and nothing else. In the metaphorical description the words mostly signify something other than what is actually said, precisely as is the case in an allegory. The parable is to be interpreted or rather applied only in terms of its leading theme (or possibly leading ideas); the metaphorical description requires, to a great extent, an interpretation in detail. The parable may be positive, the fictitious narrative directly illustrating what the parable is intended to depict. The analogy, the common idea, is positive and direct, though it may be that the *form* is negative in the narrative as well as in the application. But the parable may also be antithetic; then the main theme of the parable indicates the opposite to that which is to be depicted by means of the parable. The very antithesis gives a clear and emphatic expression to the speaker's or the author's meaning. As Jülicher emphasizes, it is quite unimportant whether the parabolic narrative is short or long. 'Physician, heal thyself' is a real parable; and it is in fact so described in St. Luke's Gospel. It is the shortest parable in the New Testament, says Jülicher.[101] It is also immaterial whether the parable has the form of a statement or of a question (examples below). The essential point is that, in one form or another, it tells us something like a coherent narrative or story.

Positive parables. A woman does not forget her sucking baby; nor is she without compassion for the child of her womb (in Hebrew the sentences take the form of rhetorical questions). Likewise Yahweh is incapable of neglecting his people.[102] — It would be absurd for the clay to say to the potter: What do you make? or for the child to say to its father: What do you beget? or to its mother: What do you bring forth? (in Hebrew the whole forms a rhetorical question). Similarly it is wong for Israel to criticize the work of Yahweh in history.[103] — Can spoil be taken from a hero ; or can the captives of a tyrant be rescued? In some circumstances that really can be done. Yahweh is in fact able to rescue the Israelites from the hand of the Babylonians.[104] — Yahweh creates the smith, who blows on the fire of coals and brings forth the implement that is needed; but He also creates the destroyer. Then comes the applica-

---

[101] *Op. cit.*, II, p. 171.

[102] XLIX.15

[103] XLV.9—10

[104] XLIX.24—25. I follow the interpretation given by e.g. Torrey, Kissane, Volz, Bentzen etc. 'Can spoil be taken from a hero?' seems to be a proverbial expression; cf. Ps. Sol. V.3.

tion: no weapon fashioned against Israel will avail; and every tongue that contends with her in judgment will be confuted.[105] — Nobody rejects the wife of his youth; nor does Yahweh cast off His own people.[106] — The rain descends, and the snow comes down from the heavens, not returning thither before it has watered the earth and made it fruitful, giving seed to the sower, and bread to the eater. So Yahweh's word does not return to Him fruitless, but will accomplish that which Yahweh has purposed, and perform that whereto it has been sent.[107]

Antithetic parables. The grass withers, the flower fades, when the breath of Yahweh blows upon it — the word of Yahweh stands for ever.[108] Youths faint and become weary, and young men totter — they that hope in Yahweh will renew their strength.[109]

It need hardly be said that the limits between the classes enumerated above cannot be drawn sharply. Some examples can be included in one group as well as in another.

It is not necessary here to analyse the notion *māšāl* in Hebrew. The term *māšāl* covers every kind of figurative expression. Metaphorical descriptions, as well as parables and allegories proper, can be characterized as *māšāl* in the Hebrew sense. For the distinctions made above, the term *māšāl* is of no importance.

A detailed study of the figurative language of Deutero-Isaiah shows that it does not aim at giving theoretical clearness only. It is intended to produce in the first place 'emotional expressiveness', to arouse fear and awe in the presence of the *numinosum* of the deity and the divine action, to evoke admiration, create faith, hope, and trust, to inspire and encourage men, to evoke feelings of joy, sorrow, commiseration, repentance, humility, shame, and consciousness of guilt, but also feelings of contempt for what is despicable, and hatred of all that is opposed to Yahweh and His will.

The ideas which are illustrated by the figurative expressions in Deutero-Isaiah are, in the first place, the omnipotence of Yahweh as manifested in creation and history, especially in His relation to the chosen people and in its deliverance from Babylonia, and, further, the election of Israel, the faithfulness, mercy, and saving grace of Yahweh, but also His wrath

---

[105] LIV.16—17

[106] LIV.6—8

[107] LV.10—11

[108] XL.7—8. DSIa here has a shorter text, the same as we find in LXX and the New Testament (1 Pet. I. 24f.). See further J. Lindblom in *Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift*, 1950, pp. 306f.

[109] XL.30—31

against His enemies, finally, His eternity, sovereign power, majesty, and the might and constancy of the divine word. Other ideas metaphorically presented are the emptiness, absurdity, and impotence of the idols and the contemptible folly of the idolaters and astrologers, the downfall of Babylon, the humiliation of the Babylonians, and Israel's vengeance on its enemies. Other conspicuous themes are the distress and the afflictions of Israel, especially as living in the Babylonian captivity and as the object of the chastisement inflicted by Yahweh, but also its perversity and obstinacy, its despondency and want of faith. In contrast to all that stands the radical reversal of the fate of Israel: the deliverance of Israel, its return and exaltation, the recovery of its own land, the transformation of that land, the re-establishment of the nation, the glorifying of the capital and the people. Magnificent metaphors describe the victorious progress of Cyrus, his might and majesty, his contemptuous treatment of his enemies; finally the calling, endowment, sufferings, and tasks of the Servant of Yahweh. More universal ideas depicted by means of vivid figures are the transience of all created things, the emptiness, weakness, insignificance, ineffectiveness of men, the ephemeral character of all worldly greatness, splendour, and power, but also the strength of those who trust in Yahweh.

This survey of the metaphors, metaphorical descriptions, comparisons and parables in Deutero-Isaiah shows that figurative language of different kinds is typical of the style of the unnamed prophet of the exile. This prophet shows a marked poetical and artistic gift. His thoughts find immediate expression in vivid imagery; and he is always anxious to illustrate through impressive symbols what he has to say.

It must, however, be admitted that allegorical pictures such as we encounter in the Ebed-Yahweh Songs are not to be found in other parts of Deutero-Isaiah. The parables employed elsewhere are much shorter and not carried through to the same extent. This observation need not be taken as an objection to the interpretation of the Ebed-Yahweh Songs given above. The new message which the prophet had to proclaim after the events in October 539 required a new form, not employed hitherto. The message of the significance of the suffering inflicted upon Israel and of its task as an instrument for the salvation of the Gentiles was so startling, so strange, so mysterious, that the prophet must use extraordinary means to render it intelligible to those to whom it was addressed. Jesus, likewise, did not always speak in parables; but He did so when mysteries were to be brought to light.

That allegorical pictures were familiar in Hebrew speech is a fact, attested by many passages in Old Testament literature.

By the well-known allegory of the trees going forth to anoint a king, Jotham, the son of Gideon, warned the inhabitants of Shechem against monarchy as such, and particularly against the rascal Abimelech, whom they had made king (Judges IX). The narrative of Nathan about the poor man's little ewe lamb (2 Sam. XII) is a parable rather than an allegory, because it is not to be interpreted in detail, but illustrates one main point. The same is true of the narrative of the widow of Tekoa, the object of which was to incline the heart of David to fetch home Absalom after the murder of his brother Amnon (2 Sam. XIV). In 1 Kings XX a member of the prophet guilds through an allegorical narrative tries to make clear to Ahab, the king of Israel, that he has offended Yahweh through having spared Ben-Hadad, the Syrian king. Amaziah, the king of Judah, once challenged Jehoash, the king of Israel, to a battle. The answer of Jehoash was given the form of a little allegory: The thornbush in Lebanon sent to the cedar saying, 'Give thy daughter to my son to wife'. And there passed by the wild beasts and trod down the thornbush (2 Kings XIV). The dreams related in the book of Genesis are often of a marked allegorical nature.

More interesting still is the fact that the prophets make very extensive use of allegorical speech. Isaiah (ch. V) describes the moral decay of Israel in the form of the allegory of a vineyard which brings forth wild grapes instead of good grapes. The allegory is, interestingly enough, immediately followed by an interpretation: The vineyard of Yahweh Sebaoth is the house of Israel etc. In Isa. XXVII, within the section of the Book of Isaiah which has often, though not quite appropriately, been called the Apocalypse of Isaiah, the security of the future Israel is described in the form of an allegory of the vineyard watched by Yahweh night and day, and defended by Him against briers and thorns.[110] In Isa. XXVIII we find the beautiful picture of the farmer who ploughs and sows, threshes and beats according to the seasons and the peculiarity of every cereal, parabolically illustrating the varying phases of Yahweh's dealings with His people. The narrative of the man coming from Edom with dyed garments, like one that treads the winepress, is rather an allegory in the strict sense, illustrating the day of vengeance decreed by Yahweh (Isa. LXIII). In Jer. IV the doom of Israel is illustrated by a *māšāl* put in the form of a vision seen by the narrator himself: I beheld the earth, and there was chaos; and the heavens, and they had no light. I beheld the mountains, and they trembled; and all the hills moved to and fro. I beheld, and there was no

[110] See further J. Lindblom, *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse. Jes. 24—27*, Lund and Leipzig 1938, pp. 53ff.

man; and all the birds of the heavens were fled etc. The *māšāl* is followed by an interpretation introduced by the common oracle formula. The story of the girdle in Jer. XIII is an allegorical narrative. In this case the allegory has taken the form of an autobiographical account of fictitious nature. The prophet tells us that he was ordered by Yahweh to procure a linen girdle and put it upon his loins, but not to put it in water. Then he was commanded to go to the Euphrates and hide it there in a hole in the rock. He did so; and after a long time he was commanded by Yahweh to go to the Euphrates once more and recover the girdle. The prophet went to the Euphrates and took the girdle from the place where it was hidden. The girdle was now marred and useless. The girdle put by the prophet on his loins is a symbol of Israel, the chosen people, bound to its God by election. As the girdle was loosened from the loins and carried off to the Euphrates, where it was destroyed, Israel will be cast off by Yahweh and perish in the exile (so according to the present text).[111] As a typical symbolic narrative in autobiographical form (the author himself is thought of as acting in what happens) the account in Jer. XIII has some affinity with the account of the widow of Tekoa. But while the latter account has the character of a parable, interesting us only in its main point, the narrative told by Jeremiah is an allegory which requires to be interpreted in detail.[112]

The Book of Ezekiel is rich in metaphors, symbols, symbolic visions and acts, parables, and allegories, and combinations of these various classes. Here we have the allegory of the vine, indicating the worthlessness and destruction of Israel (ch. XV); further, the most characteristic allegory of the two eagles, the cedar, and the vine, illustrating the historical events during the period immediately preceding the downfall

[111] It is difficult to believe that all that is related in this story really happened. The repeated journeys to the distant river Euphrates are hardly conceivable in the life of Jeremiah. Various scholars have supposed that the name of the river denotes a brook in the neighbourhood of Anathoth. But nowhere in the whole Bible does Perat signify anything but the famous Mesopotamian river. I have maintained that this account of the girdle reproduced a visionary experience (*Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur*, pp. 51f.; cf. W. Rudolph, *Jeremia*, in Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, Tübingen 1947), but it is of course possible to interpret it as pure fiction, as an allegorical narrative, composed by the prophet in order to illustrate the rejection and destruction of Israel. Rudolph explains the narrative in this way: 'Solange Juda fest an Jahwe hing, konnte er auf sein Volk stolz sein; seit es aber unter den politischen und damit religiösen Einfluss des Euphratlandes kam, ist seine Zier, d.h. die kostbare Jahwereligion völlig verdorben, und das Volk ist zu nichts mehr zu gebrauchen.' Rudolph's suggestion is noteworthy, but it necessitates a slight alteration of the text in v. 9—10.

[112] See further my Swedish book *Profetismen i Israel*, pp. 269f.

of Jerusalem in 586 (ch. XVII); the allegories of the lioness and her whelps, and of the fruitful vine which was moved to the wilderness and planted in a dry ground, illustrating the history of the last kings of Judah and the deportation of the people into Babylonia (ch. XIX). The story about the two sisters Oholah and Oholibah (ch. XXIII) is something between metaphorical description and allegory, just as the story of the pot placed on the burning fire (ch. XXIV) is a mixture of symbolic action and allegory, illustrating the approaching fate of the Jewish nation. The story of the resurrection of the dry bones in ch. XXXVII is a vision with a pronounced allegorical character, and that of the joining of the two sticks in the same chapter a mixture of symbolic action and allegory. The dreams and visions in the Book of Daniel are simply allegories in another form.

The so-called night visions in the Book of Zechariah have been keenly debated by critics from the point of view of their psychological character. Are they ecstatic visions or only imaginative fictions, or something else?[113] However that may be, every 'vision' has a marked allegorical character. It must be interpreted, even in certain details, in order to be understood in its true significance. The coronation of Joshua in VI.9ff. is a symbolic action of allegorical character.[114]

I should like to conclude this survey with some words about the marriage of Hosea in chs. I and III of his book.

Nearly twenty five years ago I examined in detail the story of Hosea's marriage.[115] I cannot find any reason for altering in essentials the view which I then advocated. Since then Professor T. H. Robinson in his Commentary on Hosea has lent the weight of his authority to my interpretation.[116] The story in question is transmitted to us in two versions,

---

[113] Hölscher interpreted them as 'Traumerlebnisse im Schlaf oder Halbschlaf', *Die Profeten*, Leipzig 1914, pp. 52ff., 339. Similarly recently K. Elliger in *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*, ed. by V. Herntrich and A. Weiser, Vol. 25, Göttingen 1950, S. 107. Sellin thought of ecstatic visions recast in literary form, Marti and Nowack of more or less deliberate creations of a vivid imagination or fanciful allegories. This last opinion was defended by me in *Profetismen i Israel*, pp. 271ff.

[114] For the night visions in Zechariah see further A. Jepsen, 'Kleine Beiträge zum Zwölfprophetenbuch III', *ZAW*, 61, 1945/48, pp. 95ff., and the important book by the Swedish scholar L. G. Rignell, *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Eine exegetische Studie*, Lund 1950. — Rowley maintains that the book of Jonah as a whole is an allegory: 'Jonah stands for the Jews. He was swallowed by the fish for his disobedience, and they swallowed in the exile for their disobedience; he was vomited to fulfil his mission of converting the heathen, and they were restored to lead the nations to God'; *The Growth of the Old Testament*, London 1950, p. 114.

[115] *Hosea literarisch untersucht* (Acta Academiae Aboensis. Hum. V), Åbo 1927.

[116] In Eissfeldt's *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*.

one in ch. I, the other in ch. III. In the first the events are narrated by a disciple of the prophet; in the second the prophet gives his own account of what happened. The second narrative does not continue the first, as is the opinion of most scholars. The two passages give us two parallel accounts of the same occurrence from two separate points of view. The first, in ch. I, is most interested in the later developments in Hosea's married life, the second, in ch. III, deals with its beginning. Taken together the two accounts give us a vivid picture of the marriage of the prophet in its chief phases.

Is this story a fiction, or does it deal with actual facts? Both conceptions are represented in the commentaries. To my mind we have to do with real history. Many difficulties connected with a historical interpretation disappear automatically when it is recognized that the two accounts deal with the same occurrence and not two different ones. That the prophet believed himself to be commanded by Yahweh to marry an unchaste woman cannot be regarded as impossible, when we consider the many curious impulses, offensive to our taste, which are recounted in Ezekiel, for instance, and in other parts of the prophetic literature. Several important details resist, as has often been observed, every attempt at allegorical interpretation. But whether the story is fiction or fact, it is in any case employed by the prophet as an allegory; and its purpose is to make clear the relations between Yahweh and His people. Yahweh loves Israel; but Israel has become faithless and is unworthy of His love. Just as in the case of Hosea and his wife, there is a contest between wrath and love in the heart of Yahweh, a conflict between the impulse to repudiate His people and the longing to hold it fast.

The story of Hosea's marriage shows that it is of no importance whether an allegorical narrative is a record of historical facts or a mere product of the imagination. Its worth as an allegory is the same in both cases. And what is essential is not the narrative as such, but the ideas which are to be illustrated thereby.

We have examined above many of the symbolic pictures of the Old Testament. Perhaps this survey will seem to have been too comprehensive, but the object was to bring out clearly the important part played in the Old Testament by figurative speech, and, in particular, by allegory.

In addition to parables, with one main point or two, there are in the Old Testament many real allegories, where every detail, or nearly every detail, is intended to be interpreted. The allegorical pictures are sometimes pure fictions, products of the imagination; and sometimes they reproduce historical facts. The narrator can describe events in which

he himself is not involved, or tell of incidents in which he personally plays a principal rôle. In the latter case we can speak of autobiographical allegories. As to form, the allegories can be presented as epic narratives, actions, dreams, or visions, either genuine ecstatic visions, or formal, literary visions. They can be expressed in the first person as well as in the third person. They can be very short or very long. They are not always logically or consistently carried through. We have samples of mixed forms: an allegorical narrative can be mingled with elements belonging to a symbolic action, and, what is more common still, the allegorical elements can be blended with elements belonging to the reality which is to be illustrated by the allegorical picture. This latter phenomenon is quite typical of the allegories of the Old Testament as well as of the parables of the Gospels.

The allegories (as well as the parables) can be connected with an interpretation or application, or it can be left to the hearer or reader to understand their meaning without help from the narrator. In the former case the interpretation is sometimes marked by כי (for instance Isa. V.7). Very often the interpretation is introduced by the oracle formula כה אמר יהוה (2 Sam. XII.7; 1 Kings XX.42; Jer. IV.27, XIII.9,13; Ez. XV.6, XXXVII.12, 19 etc.).

The four allegories of the Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah are, accordingly, by no means unparalleled in the Old Testament literature. They are only samples of a kind of figurative speech very often used in ancient Israel. Two of the Servant Songs (XLIX and L) are autobiographical allegories, two (XLII and LIII) are objective descriptions in the third person. Two are pure fancies (XLII and LIII), two relate historical facts (XLIX and L). Especially in the fourth Song historical and allegorical elements are mingled with each other. To all four Songs applications are attached. In two cases (XLII and XLIX) the oracle formula is used in them as an introductory phrase.

The explanation of the Servant Songs given above is consequently very well supported by numerous analogies in other parts of the literature of the Old Testament.

Chapter V.

The Problem of Eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah.

Many scholars of different type, orthodox and modern, have explained the unique ideas of the Servant Songs eschatologically. The Ebed of the Songs has been regarded as a Messianic figure and treated as an integral part of the eschatological outlook of Deutero-Isaiah as a whole. If one assumes a universal eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah, it is not difficult to find support for an individualistic-Messianic interpretation of the Songs.[1]

What case can be made out for the presence of eschatology in the Deutero-Isaianic prophecy as a whole?

Two contemporary scholars, P. Volz and J. Begrich, have laid particular stress on Deutero-Isaiah's supposed eschatology; and their contentions may form the fitting basis of the ensuing discussion.[2]

Volz goes farthest. He says that all the prophets of the old Testament are 'Eschatologiker', and that this is supremely true of Deutero-Isaiah. The 'eschatological' elements in the message of Deutero-Isaiah are, according to Volz, the following: What Deutero-Isaiah waits for is the 'advent of Yahweh'. This advent is the last one, the final coming of Yahweh to the world, involving the victory of Yahweh over the world,

[1] The treatment of the problem of eschatology in general by Gressmann, von Gall, Mowinckel and other pioneers in this field is so well-known that there is no need to enlarge upon it here. In addition to Mowinckel's earlier works, reference should be made to his article 'Urmensch und »Königsideologie«' in *Studia Theologica*, II, 1, Lund 1949, pp. 71—89 ('eine gemeinorientalische Eschatologie hat es nie gegeben').

[2] Many others could of course be mentioned in this connection. A. Causse for example speaks not only of eschatology, but even of 'motifs apocalyptiques' in Deutero-Isaiah; *Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse*, Paris 1937, pp. 207 ff.; cf. *Les dispersés d' Israël*, Paris 1929, pp. 34ff. Here Sellin may also be mentioned. In his article 'Die Lösung des deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtsrätsels', *ZAW*, 55, 1937, pp. 177—217, he says: 'Die weitaus meisten deuterojesajanischen Sprüche sind eschatologisch.' He speaks of 'die Endzeit', wherein the prophet stands (p. 185). The prophet is convinced 'die eschatologische Heilszeit einzuleiten' (p. 197). Hempel agrees on this point with Volz, *ZAW*, 50, 1932, p. 208.

the collapse of this world, and the establishment of a new mankind and the kingdom of God. With these events the present historical order has come to an end. Something radically new has come into existence. All of this is going to happen in the immediate future. With the downfall of Babylon and the return of the exiles the wonderful transformation is beginning.

Cyrus is the forerunner of Yahweh and of the day of the last judgment.

Among the details which are characteristic of the new world we may note: all the exiles will be gathered from all quarters of the world and return to Palestine. God's covenant with David will be extended to the nation of Israel. Jerusalem will be glorified, and Yahweh enthroned as king for ever. The deliverance from Babylonia is regarded as a repetition of the exodus from Egypt, and the victory of Yahweh over the world as a parallel to the victory of Yahweh over the Chaos-powers at creation. All of this is thought of as a divine wonder superior to all natural evolution and all human history.[3]

According to Begrich the following eschatological features are expressed in the message of the Second Isaiah: Yahweh fights against the nations and wins a glorious victory over them. Yahweh's victory involves the end of the kingdoms of this world; then follows the triumphal procession of Yahweh into Jerusalem at the head of the people whom He has delivered; and He is proclaimed as king for ever. The covenant with David is realized. Israel takes its place as sovereign nation among the nations of the world. In addition to the wonderful events in history, there are references to transformations within nature. The heavens and the earth perish; the wilderness is changed into an Eden; the age of Paradise is renewed, and so on.[4]

Do these descriptions justify us in speaking of a real eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah? I think that is wiser to speak, not of his eschatology, but rather of his view of the future. Begrich emphasizes, it is true, that an eschatological 'system' is not to be found in Deutero-Isaiah; nevertheless the single eschatological features taken together form an eschatological outlook. But even that seems to me to be going too far. Neither the sum total nor the single ideas entitle us to regard the message of the Second Isaiah as an eschatological message. That will become evident from an examination of the details.

Volz and Begrich are right in maintaining that the idea of the ending of history and the appearance of a new state of things, described in

[3] See in the Commentary particularly pp. XIXf., 31f., 43, 58, 61f., 104, 112, 114, 122, 136, 140, 189ff.

[4] *Op. cit.*, pp. 76ff., 98ff.

mythological forms, is essential for eschatology in the strict sense.[5] But is this idea really to be found in Deutero-Isaiah? I hold that it is quite unknown to this prophet. It is true that the prophet foresees a great and glorious change; the new things, however, do not mean *the end* of history but a continuation of the present historical order in ideal forms. Future history will develop on this earth, as history has done hitherto, though under better conditions. Israel's land is Palestine in a geographical sense, its capital is the historical Jerusalem, though rebuilt and splendidly beautified. The historical process will go on as before, though Israel will become the ruling nation, successfully resisting all hostile attacks. Of future conditions in the Jewish state the prophet gives us a very realistic picture in ch. LIV.13ff.: All its children will be disciples of Yahweh; their peace will be great. Israel will be established in righteousness; it will live far from all oppression. It will have no reason to fear anything. Should anyone assail, he would surely fail. No weapon fashioned against Israel will avail etc.[6]

[5] The notions 'eschatology' and 'eschatological' are very often used vaguely and without clear definition in Old Testament studies. One scholar means one thing by 'eschatology', another something quite different. I can agree only with those who consistently preserve the connection between eschatology and the last things. Hölscher is right in defining eschatology as the doctrine *de novissimis* and continuing: Eschatology is 'die Vorstellung von jenem grossen Drama der Endzeit, mit dem nach jüdischem und christlichem Glauben diese Weltzeit endet und eine neue ewige Zeit des Heils anbricht' (*Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie*, Giessen 1925, p. 3). Essential to all eschatology is the distinction between the two αἰῶνες. In the idea of the age to come there is implied an order radically different from the present historical order; and this is summed up in the phrase, 'new heavens and a new earth'. The eschatological ideas are supra-historical and supra-natural; they are essentially of a mythical nature. I should like here to quote the statement of Professor Rowley about the prophetic eschatology in his recent book *The Growth of the Old Testament*, pp. 82ff. The author describes the eschatological messages of the prophets in this way: they are 'predictions of the more distant future, not causally connected with their own times, when the Golden Age should dawn and life be incomparably beautiful'. The future blessing, however, 'was placed on the far horizons of time, with a hiatus separating it from the events of their own time and their immediate outcome.' Rowley correctly emphasizes the 'hiatus' separating the events to come from the events of the present time. That substantially corresponds with what has been said above. If the Second Isaiah, and many other prophets of the Old Testament, were to be called eschatologists when they speak of future events, this term must be taken in *another sense* than that commonly used in connection with Judaism and early Christian faith.

[6] To this passage there is a remarkable parallel in Isa XXVII.2ff. Here the new Jewish state is likened to a vineyard. Yahweh is its keeper and protector. If briars and thorns were arrayed against Him, He would march against them and burn them together. Even in this passage we are not entitled to speak of eschatology in the strict sense. Cf. my book *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse*, pp. 53ff.

It is remarkable that in future history Israel will still have to face enemies and hostile attacks as before; but with Yahweh's support Israel will doubtless be able to resist successfully and preserve the peace in its land. This being so, it is clear that the description of the new Jerusalem, rebuilt as it will be with precious stones, beryl, sapphires, rubies, and so on, is throughout poetical and metaphorical. It would be a grave misunderstanding of these words, and of the Deutero-Isaianic style in general, if they were taken in a crudely literal sense.

It is true that the prophet also speaks of an 'advent' of Yahweh in order to release His people and lead it back to its own land. But is that an eschatological idea? In many passages of the Old Testament there are references to the coming of Yahweh without a hint of an eschatological doctrine. Every manifest entrance of Yahweh in the historical order is a kind of coming of Yahweh. He comes from Sinai, from heaven, from far. He goes out as a commander before the hosts of Israel; and He comes to reveal His holy will and His almighty power. The coming of Yahweh is not in itself an eschatological idea. 'The last coming', it is true, would belong to an eschatological outlook, but of a 'last coming' there is no indication in the revelations of Deutero-Isaiah.

As Mowinckel, Hölscher, and others[7] have emphasized, the progress of Yahweh to Zion, at the head of the people whom He has delivered, is described by analogy with the cultic procession of Yahweh at the enthronement festival. But ideas and expressions taken from the cult are not in themselves eschatological. Each coming of Yahweh could appropriately be described in cultic forms. The narrative of the descent of Yahweh upon mount Sinai (Ex. XIX) is filled with cultic reminiscences, but there is no question of an eschatological reference. The terms which may be drawn from the cult serve in Deutero-Isaiah as poetical metaphors; there is no reason for taking them as elements of an eschatological doctrine.

Volz characterizes Cyrus as a 'forerunner' of Yahweh. With the 'advent' of Yahweh history is ending. Thus Cyrus comes to belong to the eschatological ideology. Begrich goes so far as to conceive Cyrus as the Messiah in the eschatological sense. In fact, Cyrus in XLV.1 is called by Yahweh His 'anointed' (משיחו), but it cannot possibly be demonstrated that this term must necessarily be interpreted in the eschatological-Messianic sense. It is nowhere said that Cyrus shall be a king of Israel and the founder of the Messianic kingdom. Cyrus in Deutero-Isaiah is not a 'forerunner' of Yahweh, but an instrument in Yahweh's hand to perform

[7] For instance R. Gyllenberg in *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 5, 1940, pp. 87f.

His plans in history, and for that reason chosen, called by Yahweh, and endowed with the highest gifts. He is 'anointed' as a *king*; and he is the anointed *of Yahweh* because he is chosen by Yahweh and stands, as His servant, in a special personal relation to Him (cf. 1 Sam. XXIV.7; Hab. III.13; Ps. II.2, CV.15 etc.)[8]

The return of the exiles from Babylonia and the victory of Yahweh over His enemies are described as parallels to the first exodus-miracle and the subjugating of the Chaos-powers by Yahweh (XLIII.16—21, LI.9—11). But the crossing of the Red sea as well as the killing of Rahab are in the context simply *analogies* adduced by the prophet in order to convince those who were in doubt of the power of Yahweh. There is in these passages no hint of an eschatological doctrine. That such ideas may, in certain circumstances, be used as elements in an eschatological scheme is a very different matter. That is, however, not the case in the revelations of the Second Isaiah.

It is a fact that Deutero-Isaiah often speaks about judgment on the Gentiles. Yahweh fights against them, vanquishes them, and crushes them. But the hope of Yahweh's victory over the Gentiles in Deutero-Isaiah is not the same as the eschatological idea of the universal judgment of mankind and the escape of the 'remnant'. In Deutero-Isaiah the object of the judgment is the Babylonians as the oppressors of Israel. Babylon will be overthrown, Babylonia will collapse as an empire, but the punishment which is to be inflicted is in revenge for all the sufferings that the Babylonians have inflicted on Israel. It is not the pagan nations as such, not the whole of mankind that will be condemned in the coming day of judgment as the object of Yahweh's wrath, but the enemies of Israel in an actual historical situation. These enemies of Israel will be crushed by Yahweh, because Israel's enemies are also His. In every period of its history Israel regarded its enemies as the enemies of Yahweh, whether they were Egyptians, Canaanites, Midianites, Philistines, Syrians, Assyrians, or Babylonians. That the punishment at times is described in terms which have mythological associations, does not make it a judgment in an eschatological sense. When occasionally other peoples are mentioned as subjugated under Israel (e.g. XLV.14, XLIX.22f.), the glorification of Israel is the all-dominating interest, not the universal judgment of the nations on account of their sins.

The end of the exile and the return of the captives is not an eschatological idea in itself. Already Jeremiah was assured that the exile would not last for ever. This hope simply emerged as a necessary consequence of

---

[8] Likewise R. Kittel, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

the idea of the election of Israel. It seemed to be impossible that Yahweh could cast off His own people and allow it to be eradicated in the pagan world.

The kingdom of Yahweh, in the sense of a perfection of the already existing kingdom of Yahweh over Israel,[9] the conversion of the Gentiles to Yahweh, Israel as the centre of a spiritual empire are likewise ideas which refer to actual historical developments, and are organically connected with and rooted in the idea of election. They are intimately linked with the dynamic and universalistic conception of Yahweh and His *tôrâh*. How this universalistic idea became actual, living and dominating in the faith of the Second Isaiah, we have seen in the preceding chapter. We have here not eschatological doctrines and myths concerning the end of history and the appearance of a new world, but with simple postulates of a deep, firm, and intense religious faith. The same is true of the total conversion and splendid glorification of Israel. This prospect is simply the accomplishment in actual historical life of the basic idea of the election of Israel.

In many passages there are references to cosmic events reminiscent of the apocalyptic 'signs'; and these are interpreted by Begrich as eschatological elements. But Begrich has, it seems to me, misconceived these passages. When we read in L.3: 'I clothe the heavens with darkness, I make sackcloth their covering', the thought is not of future miraculous occurrences, but of ordinary natural phenomena such as clouds, mist, dust, sand, and similar causes of darkness.[10] In LI.6 — 'the heavens vanish like smoke, and the earth wears out like a garment' etc. — it is not said that the collapse of the created world is approaching, but that the salvation of Yahweh abides for ever, while the heavens are destined to vanish and the earth to wear out. The prophet is clearly familiar with a traditional, popular idea of the destruction of the world, and employs it in an antithetic comparison in order to emphasize the eternity of the saving work of Yahweh. That has nothing to do with eschatology as a dominating doctrine in the preaching of the Second Isaiah. LIV.10 is similar: 'Though the mountains should move and the hills be shaken, yet My mercy shall not depart from thee, nor My covenant of peace be shaken.' Volz, who otherwise lays stress upon those features in Deutero-Isaiah which might be interpreted eschatologically, remarks here correctly: Deutero-Isaiah does not think here of an earthquake in connection

[9] LII. 7 compared with XLI.21, XLIII.15, XLIV.6.

[10] In v. 2 the expressions refer of course to the chaos myth and to the events of the first exodus, though it may be that these patterns are here taken in a more general sense.

with the eschatological theophany of Yahweh. He adds that the prophet's language is metaphorical. I should prefer to say: the prophet employs an antithetic comparison in order to declare that Yahweh's mercy is more enduring than even the most lasting elements in nature, the mountains and the rocks.

A special problem is presented by the descriptions of the transformation of the wilderness which we find in many passages of Deutero-Isaiah, and which are interpreted by several commentators as speaking of eschatological miracles. In XL.3—5 we read for instance: 'Prepare the way of Yahweh in the wilderness, make plain in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be raised, and every mountain and hill shall sink down. The rugged ground shall become a plain, the rough ways a lowland.' The question is: are we here dealing with plain miracles, or are the expressions used by the prophet to be taken as metaphors, simply indicating that the return of the exiles across the wilderness will be easy, safe, and comfortable? In several passages the metaphorical character of expressions of similar nature is obvious and indubitable. So in XLI.17—20: the distress of the exiles is here likened to life in the desert, and wonderful transformation of the desert is a metaphorical description of the blessings which Yahweh will bestow on His afflicted people. In XLIV.3—4, too, the prophet manifestly thinks of general blessings, of both a spiritual and a material character, for the chosen people: 'I will pour water on the thirsty ground, and streams on the dry land. I will pour My spirit on thy seed, and My blessing on thy offspring', etc. This is not said of the transformation of nature, but of that of the people itself. The passage XLIII.1—2 deals with the support and protection promised by Yahweh to His people, water and fire being symbols of peril in a general sense: 'Though thou pass through waters, I will be with thee, and through rivers, they shall not overwhelm thee; though thou walk through fire, thou shalt not be scorched, and the flames shall not burn thee.' XLII.15—16 describes in vivid imagery the absolute power of Yahweh as an avenger and supporter: 'I will make waste mountains and hills, and dry up all their herbage; I will make rivers into arid land, and dry up the pools. I will make the blind walk in a way they know not, and in paths they know not I will make them tread; I will make darkness light before them, and the crooked places straight.'[11]

[11] When it is said that Yahweh will dry up all the herbage of the mountains, Köhler thinks of 'die den Wanderer hemmende Macchie', *op. cit.*, p. 134. Better Kissane: 'The wasting of the mountains and hills may be merely a figurative manner of describing the defeat of Yahweh's enemies'. Compare also Torrey's explanation *ad. loc.*

XLIII.19—20 and LV.12—13 deal in fact with the return of the exiles across the wilderness, the two passages containing a promise for the exiles of an easy march from Babylonia to Palestine. But this is so obviously the highly-coloured language of poetry that a literal interpretation is excluded: The beasts of the wild, the ostriches and the jackals will honour Yahweh. The mountains and the hills will burst into song, and the trees of the field will clap their hands, when they witness the procession of the released exiles. The metaphorical character of all these passages makes it probable that XL.3—5, XLVIII.21, and XLIX.9—11 are also to be interpreted in a similar manner. In lofty poetical imagery they assure the exiles that they have nothing to fear in a journey through the desert. The common dangers which menace men in the wilderness will be removed by Yahweh. The journey through the wild will become a triumphal progress, not a perilous enterprise.

Interpreted in this way the descriptions of the transformation of the wilderness have nothing to do with the metamorphosis of nature in eschatological scenes. From this point of view also the Second Isaiah obviously ought not to be called an eschatologist.[12]

Certain scholars have interpreted the Ebed-Yahweh Songs (or some of them) in an eschatological sense. The Servant of Yahweh, it is said, is the coming Messiah, and an integral part of the eschatological hope. If nothing like an eschatological outlook is to be found in other parts of Deutero-Isaiah, it can hardly be appropriate to talk about eschatology in the Ebed-Yahweh Songs. We have seen that the semblance of eschatology is in many cases presented by the abundant use of poetical metaphors

[12] I am in entire agreement with the remarks on Deutero-Isaiah's style made by Professor Pfeiffer in his *Introduction*, pp. 462ff. Pfeiffer lays great emphasis upon the poetical imagination of the Second Isaiah. He says, 'The poet's imagination is so vivid that he lives in the magnificent future rather than in the depressing present'. And further: 'The poet's intense enthusiasm, fanciful Oriental imagination, and burning passion lift him above the world of reality to the realm of fantastic dreams.' In these fantastic dreams he also includes the descriptions of the transformation of the desert. Pfeiffer makes no reference to eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah. It is quite another matter that the Second Isaiah, owing to his fanciful imagery in describing the future, in fact became 'the father of apocalypse' (p. 479). Cf. Rowley, *The Missionary Message*, p. 48 (about the transformation of nature): 'All of this, of course, is highly poetic, and is not to be taken *au pied de la lettre* as representing the prophet's expectation. In the language of superb poetry he was encouraging men, and expressing his certainty of the coming deliverance.' Cf. *The Re-Discovery*, p. 203. Sound observations on the importance of poetical language in the Oriental mode of expression are to be found in the article by Professor A. Guillaume 'The Servant Poems in the Deutero-Isaiah', *Theology*, 11, 1925, pp. 254ff.

and similes in Deutero-Isaiah. Thus we are disposed to interpret these Songs, too, metaphorically or symbolically, and not as eschatological pictures. They are allegorical pictures illustrating the situation of Israel during the epoch of the Babylonian exile, and the high task entrusted to it. The ideas which they embody belong to present history, not to a future supranatural existence. The prophet is conscious that he is witnessing not the end of history, but a new act of a historical drama, which will have its continuation in this world, not in a world to come. The impression of something preternatural and supramundane depends ultimately on his style, on the symbols, comparisons and metaphors which he uses so lavishly. The Second Isaiah is more a poet than an eschatologist, more a man of imagination than a man of doctrine, more a man of an intense and ardent faith than a speculative mythologist.

Conclusion.

In this study it was my hope, in the first place, to reach a better understanding of the so called Servant Songs in Deutero-Isaiah. It had become clear to me that it was impossible to solve the problems raised by these Songs without reaching a decision about their literary character, which could not be done unless full account was taken of the contexts to which the Songs belong. I found that certain passages, immediately connected with the Songs, were intimately related to them in respect of their contents, and ought not, as has often been done, to be separated from them. Thereby, as I hope, a vexed problem has been solved in a very natural way.

A careful examination resulted in the conclusion that the Servant Songs are to be explained as allegorical pictures, the connected passages giving the interpretation, or application, of them. Accordingly it is not appropriate to ask: *who is* the servant of the Songs? The correct question is: what does the servant figure *signify*? The right answer to this question is indicated by the interpretative passages, which in all cases manifestly deal with the people of Israel. Thus the servant signifies Israel. In a symbolic manner the Servant Songs illustrate the call of Israel, its present situation, and the high task given it by Yahweh. In the *Servant oracles* (the allegorical pictures taken together with their interpretations) the prophet presents a view of the fate of his people which had been revealed to him in face of the distressing historical events about 539 B. C.

If the Servant Songs, and the passages associated with them, are interpreted in this way, many fanciful and romantic pictures of a histori-

cal person identified with the servant of the Songs are seen to be unnecessary. In my view the theories of Staerk, Sellin, Kittel, Rudolph, Oesterley, and others who have taken a similar line lead nowhere. The servant is a symbol; though it may be that in two of the Songs the experiences of the prophet himself served as material for the allegorical picture.

Neither have I had any reason, in explaining the Servant of Yahweh in the Servant Songs as a symbolic figure, to make use of the principle of 'corporate personality' as advanced by H. Wheeler Robinson,[1] nor of M. Buber's sagacious conception of the Servant as a series of figurations, of which the Second Isaiah felt himself as one.[2]

The ever-recurring question: is the servant an individual or a community? involves a wrong formulation of the problem. The servant of the Songs is thought of as an individual (I belong decidedly to 'the individualists' among the students of this problem, not to 'the collectivists'), but he symbolizes allegorically a community, namely Israel. In this way the valuable elements of the individual as well as of the collective interpretations are retained. Thus the conflict between the 'individualists' and the 'collectivists' can be settled.

Finally, if my attempt to solve the Ebed-Yahweh problem can be accepted, every reason for separating the Ebed-Yahweh Songs from the bulk of the Deutero-Isaianic utterances disappears. The ideas expressed by means of the Songs fit extremely well into the message of the Second Isaiah as a whole, regarded in the light that falls upon it from contemporary history.

On my interpretation the much discussed 'Begleitworte', to use Staerk's expression, which in the actual text are attached to the Songs, must likewise be regarded as authentic Deutero-Isaianic sayings inseparably connected with the Songs.

There are many analogies to the allegorical pictures in Deutero-Isaiah in other parts of the literature of the Old Testament. A careful examination of the allegories and parables found, particularly, in the prophetic literature substantially supports the explanation of the Servant Songs here set forth.

The Second Isaiah has often been labelled by scholars as an 'eschatologist', and even as the originator of the Israelite-Jewish eschatology as a whole. If eschatology means a doctrine, or a message, concerning the end of history and a new age including 'new heavens and a new earth', there is no eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah at all. Nor do the Servant

[1] 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality' in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments* (Beih. z. ZAW, 66), pp. 49—62.

[2] *The Prophetic Faith*, p. 230.

Songs contain any eschatology, as has been maintained by several scholars. What has been understood as eschatology in Deutero-Isaiah appears, on more careful exegesis, to be either real history, perhaps described in rather idealistic terms, or, in many cases, nothing but fanciful, poetical imagery. Such expressions must be interpreted as impressive symbols, not as exact descriptions of reality. The use of single, popular, eschatological motifs does not make an author an eschatologist.

In my opinion scholars have, on the whole, often sadly misunderstood the symbolic language used by the writers of the Old Testament. They have not seldom treated metaphors, symbols, figurative pictures as precise and exact descriptions of reality, quite in opposition to Hebrew modes of expression. Thus many passages in the Old Testament have been understood as eschatology, while they in fact are simply poetry.

The whole question of the eschatology of the Old Testament must be taken up afresh along new lines, and some attempt must be made to provide satisfactory answers to the following questions: What is eschatology? In what sense can the term 'eschatology' be used in connection with the earlier prophets of the Old Testament? How can eschatology proper be distinguished from poetical descriptions of future history? When does eschatology appear in Israelite-Jewish religion and literature? What is the origin of Israelite-Jewish eschatology? To find satisfactory answers to those questions is one of the most urgent tasks incumbent upon Old Testament scholarship to day.[3]

---

[3] A fresh attempt to classify the various 'eschatological' ideas of Judaism is to be found in the article by C. Steuernagel 'Die Strukturlinien der Entwicklung der jüdischen Eschatologie' in *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet gewidmet*, pp. 479—487. But not even in this article any answers are given to those questions which have been proposed above. — After finishing this study I have come across the new work by S. Mowinckel, *Han som kommer. Messiasforventningen i det Gamle Testament og på Jesu tid*, Köbenhavn 1951. I do not agree with Mowinckel in his interpretation of the Servant Songs, but in what he says about the eschatology I share his opinion on essential points.

List of Works Consulted

Arbusow, L., *Colores rhetorici*, Göttingen 1948.

Barnes, W. E., 'Cyrus the »Servant of Jehovah». Isa. XLII, 1—4 (7)', *JTS*, 32, 1931, pp. 32—39.

Begrich, J., *Studien zu Deuterojesaja* (*Beiträge zur Wiss. vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, 4. Folge, Heft 25), Stuttgart 1938.

Bentzen, Aage, *Jesaja*, II, *Jes. 40—66*, Köbenhavn 1943.

— *Messias. Moses redivivus. Menschensohn. Skizzen zum Thema Weissagung und Erfüllung*, Zürich 1948.

Bewer, J. A., 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zum Alten Testament', *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet ... gewidmet*, Tübingen 1950, pp. 65—76.

Birkeland, H., *Zum hebräischen Traditionswesen. Die Komposition der prophetischen Bücher des Alten Testaments*, Oslo 1938.

Bräunlich, E., 'Beiträge zur Gesellschaftsordnung der arabischen Beduinenstämme', *Islamica*, 6, 1934, pp. 68—111, 182—229.

Buber, M., *The Prophetic Faith*, New York 1949.

Budde, K., *Das Buch Jesaia. Kap. 40—66*, in Kautzsch-Bertholet, *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments*, 4. Aufl., 1. Band, Tübingen 1922.

Buhl, F., *Jesaja oversat og fortolket*, 2. Udg., Köbenhavn and Kristiania 1912.

Burrows, E., *The Gospel of the Infancy and other Biblical Essays*, London 1940.

Burrows, M. (with the assistance of J. C. Trever and W. H. Brownlee), *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, Vol. I. *The Isaiah Manuscript and the Habakkuk Commentary*, New Haven 1950.

The Cambridge Ancient History, 4, 1930.

Causse, A., *Les dispersés d'Israël. Les origines de la diaspora et son rôle dans la formation du judaïsme*, Paris 1929.

— *Du groupe ethnique à la communauté religieuse. Le problème sociologique de la religion d'Israël*, Paris 1937.

Cazelles, H., 'La question du »lamed auctoris»', *Revue biblique*, 56, 1949, pp. 93—101.

Cheyne, T. K., *The Prophecies of Isaiah*, I—II, 4th and 5th ed., London 1886, 1889.

Danell, G. A., *Studies in the Name Israel in the Old Testament*, Uppsala 1946.

De Liagre-Böhl, F. M. T., 'Missions- und Erwählungsgedanke in Alt-Israel', *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet ... gewidmet*, Tübingen 1950, pp. 77—96.

Driver, G. R., 'Linguistic and Textual Problems: Isaiah XL—LXVI', *JTS*, 36, 1935, pp. 396—406.

— 'Misreadings in the Old Testament', *Die Welt des Orients*, Wuppertal 1948, pp. 234—238.

Duhm, B., *Das Buch Jesaia übersetzt und erklärt*, Göttingen 1892.

Dürr, L., *Ursprung und Ausbau der israelitisch-jüdischen Heilandserwartung. Ein Beitrag zur Theologie des Alten Testaments*, Berlin 1925.

Eichrodt, W., *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, 3, Leipzig 1939.

Eissfeldt, O., *Der Gottesknecht bei Deuterojesaja (Jes. 40- 55) im Lichte der israelitischen Anschauung von Gemeinschaft und Individuum (Beiträge zur Religionsgeschichte des Altertums*, Heft 2), Halle (Saale) 1933.

Elliger, K., *Deuterojesaja in seinem Verhältnis zu Tritojesaja (Beiträge zur Wiss. vom Alten und Neuen Testament*, 4. Folge, Heft 11), Stuttgart 1933.

— *Das Buch der zwölf Kleinen Propheten*, II (in *Das Alte Testament Deutsch*, herausgegeben von V. Herntrich und A. Weiser), Göttingen 1950.

Engnell, I., 'Profetia och tradition. Några synpunkter på ett gammaltestamentligt centralproblem', *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 12, 1947, pp. 110—139.

— 'The 'Ebed Yahweh Songs and the Suffering Messiah in »Deutero-Isaiah»', *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, 31, 1948, pp. 54—93.

Fischer, J., *Isaias 40—55 und die Perikopen vom Gottesknecht. Eine kritisch-exegetische Studie (Alttestamentliche Abhandlungen*, 6, 4/5), Münster i. W. 1916.

Fredriksson, H., *Jahwe als Krieger. Studien zum alttestamentlichen Gottesbild*, Lund 1945.

Gall, A. von, Βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ. *Eine religionsgeschichtliche Studie zur vorkirchlichen Eschatologie*, Heidelberg 1926.

Gesenius, W.,-Kautzsch, E., *Hebräische Grammatik*, 27. Aufl., Leipzig 1902.

Glahn, L., and Köhler, L., *Der Prophet der Heimkehr (Jesaja 40—66)*, Kopenhagen and Giessen 1934.

Gressmann, H., 'Die literarische Analyse Deuterojesajas', *ZAW*, 34, 1914, pp. 254—297.

— *Der Messias*, Göttingen 1929.

Guillaume, A., 'The Servant Poems in the Deutero-Isaiah', *Theology*, 11, 1925, pp. 254—263, 309—319; 12, 1926, pp. 2—10, 63—72.

Gyllenberg, R., 'Till julevangeliets exeges', *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 5, 1940, pp. 83—94.

Haller, M., 'Die Kyros-Lieder Deuterojesajas', in *Eucharisterion. Studien zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments Hermann Gunkel ... dargebracht*, Göttingen 1923, I, pp. 261—277.

Hempel, J., 'Vom irrenden Glauben', *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*, 7, 1929/30, pp. 631—660.

— 'Chronik', *ZAW*, 50, 1932, pp. 205—216.

— 'Zu Jes. 52, 13', *ZAW*, 55, 1937, pp. 309—310.

Herntrich, V., 'Gottes Knecht und Gottes Reich nach Jesaja 40—55', *Zeitschrift für systematische Theologie*, 16, 1939, pp. 132—170.

Hertzberg, H. W., 'Die prophetische Kritik am Kult', *Theologische Literaturzeitung*, 75, 1950, cols. 219—226.

— 'Die Entwicklung des Begriffes משפט im AT', II, *ZAW*, 41, 1923, pp. 16ff.

Hölscher, G., *Die Profeten. Untersuchungen zur Religionsgeschichte Israels*, Leipzig 1914.

— *Die Ursprünge der jüdischen Eschatologie*, Giessen 1925.

Jahnow, H., *Das hebräische Leichenlied im Rahmen der Völkerdichtung* (Beih. z. *ZAW*, 36), Giessen 1923.

Jepsen, A., 'Kleine Beiträge zum Zwölfprophetenbuch III', *ZAW*, 61, 1945/48, pp. 95—114.

Johansson, N., *Parakletoi. Vorstellungen von Fürsprechern für die Menschen vor Gott in der alttestamentlichen Religion, im Spätjudentum und Urchristentum*, Lund 1940.

Johnson, A. R., *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel*, Cardiff 1949.

— 'Jonah II. 3—10: A Study in Cultic Phantasy', *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor T. H. Robinson*, Edinburgh 1950, pp. 82—102.

Jülicher, A., *Die Gleichnisreden Jesu*, 2. Aufl., Tübingen 1910.

Kayser, W., *Das sprachliche Kunstwerk. Eine Einführung in die Literaturwissenschaft*, Bern 1948.

Kissane, E. J., *The Book of Isaiah: Translated from a Critically Revised Hebrew Text with Commentary*, Vol. II (XL—LXVI), Dublin 1943.

Kittel, G., *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1933 ff.

Kittel, R., *Gestalten und Gedanken in Israel. Geschichte eines Volkes in Charakterbildern*, 2. Aufl., Leipzig.

Köhler, L., *Deuterojesaja (Jesaja 40—55) stilkritisch untersucht* (Beih. z. *ZAW*, 37), Giessen 1923.

— *Lexicon in veteris testamenti libros*, Leiden 1948 ff.

Laue, L., *Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder im II Teil des Jesaia exegetisch-kritisch und biblisch-theologisch untersucht*, Wittenberg 1898.

Levy, R., *Deutero-Isaiah. A Commentary*, Oxford 1925.

Lindblom, J., *Die literarische Gattung der prophetischen Literatur. Eine literargeschichtliche Untersuchung zum Alten Testament* (*Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift* 1924. Teologi, 1), Uppsala 1924.

— 'Det offentliga talet i det gamla Israel. En stilkritisk undersökning', *Studier tilegnede Frants Buhl*, Köbenhavn 1925, pp. 112—126.

— *Hosea literarisch untersucht* (*Acta Academiae Aboensis. Hum. V*), Åbo 1927.

— *Profetismen i Israel*, Stockholm 1934.

— *Israels religion i gammaltestamentlig tid*, Stockholm 1936.

— *Boken om Job och hans lidande*, Lund 1940.

— *La composition du livre de Job* (*Bulletin de la société royale des lettres de Lund 1944—45*, III), Lund 1945.

— *Die Jesaja-Apokalypse. Jes. 24—27* (*Lunds Universitets Årsskrift*. N.F. Avd. 1. Bd 34. Nr 3), Lund and Leipzig 1938.

— 'Deuterojesaja i den nyfunna Jesaja-handskriften från Palestina', *Svensk teologisk kvartalskrift*, 26, 1950, pp. 302—314.

— 'Die Ebed Jahwe-Orakel in der neuentdeckten Jesajahandschrift (DSIa)', *ZAW*, 63, 1951.

Lindhagen, C., *The Servant Motif in the Old Testament. A Preliminary Study to the 'Ebed-Yahweh Problem' in Deutero-Isaiah*, Uppsala 1950.

Lods, A., *Les prophètes d' Israël et les débuts du judaïsme*, Paris 1935.

— *Histoire de la littérature hébraïque et juive depuis les origines jusqu'à la ruine de l'état juif*, Paris 1950.

Lofthouse, W. F., 'Some Reflections on the Servant Songs', *JTS*, 48, 1947, pp. 169—176.

Marti, K., *Das Buch Jesaja erklärt*, Tübingen 1900.

— *Das Dodekapropheton erklärt*, Tübingen 1904.

Morgenstern, J., 'Two Prophecies from 520—516 B.C.', *Hebrew Union College Annual*, 22, 1949, pp. 365—431.

Mowinckel, S., 'Die Komposition des deuterojesajanischen Buches', *ZAW*, 49, 1931, pp. 87—112, 242—260.
— Review of G. Östborn, *Tōrā in the Old Testament* in *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 13, 1948, pp. 76—80.
— 'Urmensch und »Königsideologie»', *Studia theologica*, II, 1, Lund 1949, pp. 71—89.
— *Han som kommer. Messiasforventningen i det Gamle Testament og på Jesu tid*, Köbenhavn 1951.
North, C. R., *The Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah. An Historical and Critical Study*, London 1948.
— 'The »Former Things» and the »New Things» in Deutero-Isaiah', *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor T. H. Robinson*, Edinburgh 1950, pp. 111—126.
Noth, M., *Die israelitischen Personennamen im Rahmen der gemeinsemitischen Namengebung*, Stuttgart 1928.
Nowack, W., *Die kleinen Propheten übersetzt und erklärt*, 2. Aufl., Göttingen 1903.
Nyberg, H. S., 'Smärtornas man. En studie till Jes. 52,13—53,12', *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, 7, 1942, pp. 5—82.
Östborn, G., *Tōrā in the Old Testament. A Semantic Study*, Lund 1945.
Oesterley, W. O. F., and Robinson, T. H., *An Introduction to the Books of the Old Testament*, London and New York 1934.
Olmstead, A. T., *History of the Persian Empire (Achaemenid Period)*, Chicago 1948.
Pedersen, J., *Israel, its Life and Culture*, I—II, London and Copenhagen 1926.
Pfeiffer, R. H., *Introduction to the Old Testament*, New York and London 1941.
Pipping, R., *Uttrycksbehov och stilarter (Acta Academiae Aboensis.* Hum. III,8), Åbo 1922.
Ploeg, J. van der, *Les chants du serviteur de Jahvé dans la seconde partie du livre d' Isaïe (chap. 40—55)*, Paris 1936.
— *'Šāpaṭ* et *mišpāṭ'*, *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, II, 1943, pp. 144—155.
— 'Les pauvres d'Israël et leur piété', *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, VII, 1950, pp. 236—270.
— 'Les chefs du peuple d'Israël et leur titres', *Revue biblique*, 57, 1950, pp. 40—61.
Reider, J., 'Contributions to the Hebrew Lexicon', *ZAW*, 53, 1935, pp. 270—277.
Rignell, L. G., *Die Nachtgesichte des Sacharja. Eine exegetische Studie*, Lund 1950.
Robinson, H. W., 'The Hebrew Conception of Corporate Personality', in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments* (Beih. z. *ZAW*, 66), Berlin 1936, pp. 49—62.
Robinson, T. H., *Hosea* (in *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, herausgegeben von O. Eissfeldt), Tübingen 1936.
Rowley, H. H., *The Missionary Message of the Old Testament*, London 1945.
— *The Re-Discovery of the Old Testament*, London 1946.
— *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, London 1950.
— *The Growth of the Old Testament*, London 1950.
Rudolph, W., 'Der exilische Messias', *ZAW*, 43, 1925, pp. 90—114.
— *Jeremia* (in *Handbuch zum Alten Testament*, herausgegeben von O. Eissfeldt), Tübingen 1947.
Schian, M., *Die Ebed-Jahwe-Lieder in Jes. 40—66. Ein literarkritischer Versuch*, Halle 1895.
Schweitzer, A., *Geschichte der Leben-Jesu-Forschung*, 2. Aufl., Tübingen 1913.

Sellin, E., *Das Zwölfprophetenbuch übersetzt und erklärt*, II, Leipzig 1930.
— 'Tritojesaja, Deuterojesaja und das Gottesknechtsproblem', *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift*, 41, 1930, pp. 73—93, 145—173.
— 'Die Lösung des deuterojesajanischen Gottesknechtsrätsels', *ZAW*, 55, 1937, pp. 177—217.
Smith, J. M. P., and Irwin, W. A., *The Prophets and their Times*, 2nd ed., Chicago 1947.
Smith, Sidney, *Isaiah Chapters XL—LV. Literary Criticism and History* (Schweich Lectures 1940), London 1944.
Snaith, N. H., 'The So-called Servant Songs', *The Expository Times*, 56, 1944/45, pp. 79—81.
— 'The Servant of the Lord in Deutero-Isaiah', *Studies in Old Testament Prophecy Presented to Professor T. H. Robinson*, Edinburgh 1950, pp. 178—200.
Staerk, W., *Die Ebed Jahwe-Lieder in Jesaja 40ff. Ein Beitrag zur Deuterojesaja-Kritik* (*Beiträge zur Wiss. vom Alten Testament*, 14), Leipzig 1913.
Steuernagel, C., 'Die Strukturlinien der Entwicklung der jüdischen Eschatologie', *Festschrift Alfred Bertholet ... gewidmet*, Tübingen 1950, pp. 479—487.
Stevenson, W. B., 'Successive Phases in the Career of the Babylonian Isaiah', in *Werden und Wesen des Alten Testaments* (Beih. z. *ZAW*, 66), Berlin 1936, pp. 89—96.
Torczyner, H., 'Presidential Address', *The Journal of the Palestine Oriental Society*, 16, 1936, pp. 1—8.
— 'The Firmament and the Clouds', and 'Additional Note', *Studia theologica*, I, Lund 1948, pp. 188—196, II, 1949, pp. 98.
Torrey, C. C., *The Second Isaiah. A new Interpretation*, Edinburgh 1928.
Volz, P., *Jesaia II übersetzt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1932.
Vriezen, T. C., 'The Term *Hizza*: Lustration and Consecration', *Oudtestamentische Studiën*, VII, 1950, pp. 201—235.
Widengren, G., 'Hieros gamos och underjordsvistelse. Studier till det sakrala kungadömet i Israel', in *Religion och Bibel, Nathan Söderblom-Sällskapets Årsbok*, 7, 1948, pp. 17—46.
Wifstrand, A., *Tider och stilar*, Lund 1944.

Index of Authors

Anderson, G. W., 5.
Arbusow, L., 76.

Barnes, W. E., 18.
Begrich, J., 15f., 17, 27, 32, 47, 66, 69—71, 75, 83, 94—101.
Bentzen, Aage, 18f., 20f., 32, 46, 55, 66, 86.
Bertholet, A., 20, 30f., 104.
Bewer, J. A., 30.
Birkeland, H., 66.
Bräunlich, E., 10.
Buber, M., 20, 22, 44, 71, 103.
Budde, K., 20, 27, 31, 34.
Buhl, F., 20f., 34, 55, 66.
Burrows, E., 30.
Burrows, M., 5.

The Cambridge Ancient History, 67.
Causse, A., 94.
Cazelles, H., 81.
Cheyne, T. K., 33, 66.

Danell, G. A., 31.
De Liagre-Böhl, F. M. T., 31, 47.
Driver, G. R., 26, 28, 44f., 56.
Duhm, B., 7, 12, 19, 22, 27, 31, 34, 44, 66.
Dürr, L., 46.

Eichrodt, W., 46.
Eissfeldt, O., 49, 91.
Elliger, K., 27, 34, 47, 61, 91.
Engnell, I., 11, 13, 18, 26, 32, 38, 44, 46, 59, 66, 76.

Fischer, J., 20, 27, 35, 37.
Fredriksson, H., 81.

Gall, A. von, 94.
Gesenius, W., 45, 49, 61.
Glahn, L., 66.
Gressmann, H., 9, 15, 17f., 20, 27, 31f., 34, 55, 94.
Guillaume, A., 101.
Gunkel, H., 20, 58.
Gyllenberg, R., 97.

Haller, M., 20, 58.
Hempel, J., 18, 38, 53, 69, 73, 94.
Herntrich, V., 73, 91.
Hertzberg, H. W., 16, 59.
Hölscher, G., 91, 96f.

Irwin, W. A., 31, 47, 69.

Jahnow, H., 47.
Jepsen, A., 91.
Johansson, N., 47.
Johnson, A. R., 45f.
Jülicher, A., 75f., 79f., 86.

Kautzsch, E., 20, 45, 49, 61.
Kayser, W., 76.
Kissane, E. J., 9f., 13, 16, 20, 27f., 31f., 33, 35, 38f., 58, 86, 100.
Kittel, G., 22.
Kittel, R., 53, 98, 103.
Köhler, L., 11, 21, 27, 34, 44, 66, 75, 83, 100.

Laue, L., 37.
Levy, R., 22.
Lindblom, J., 10, 13, 16, 28, 33, 38, 44, 55, 58, 60, 77, 81, 87, 89f., 91, 96.
Lindhagen, C., 15, 18, 66.
Lods, A., 31, 39.
Lofthouse, W. F., 13f.

Marti, K., 20, 34, 66, 91.
Morgenstern, J., 56.
Mowinckel, S., 9, 18f., 20, 27, 29, 31, 59, 66, 94, 97, 104.

North, C. R., 5, 7—11, 12, 15, 18, 20f., 27, 37, 39f., 44, 53, 60, 71.
Noth, M., 41.
Nowack, W., 91.
Nyberg, H. S., 38—51.

Östborn, G., 18.
Oesterley, W. O. E., 14, 69, 103.
Olmstead, A. T., 67.

Pedersen, J., 21, 77.
Pfeiffer, R. H., 69, 101.
Pipping, R., 76.
Ploeg, J. van der, 14, 16, 20, 44, 55, 84.

Reider, J., 84.
Rignell, L. G., 91.
Robinson, H. W., 103.
Robinson, T. H., 14, 16, 20, 45, 69, 91.
Rowley, H. H., 22, 91, 96, 101.
Rudolph, W., 31, 90, 103.

Schian, M., 37.
Schweitzer, A., 7.
Sellin, E., 34, 91, 94, 103.
Smith, J. M. P., 31, 47, 69.
Smith, Sidney, 15, 18, 59, 67, 71, 82.
Snaith, N. H., 16, 27f., 37, 45, 54, 56, 58.
Staerk, W., 13, 19, 27, 32f., 37, 69, 103.
Steuernagel, C., 104.
Stevenson, W. B., 68f.

Torczyner, H., 22, 84.
Torrey, C. C., 17, 26, 39, 45, 55, 86, 100.

Volz, P., 13f., 16, 18f., 20, 26f., 33f., 56, 66, 86, 94—101.
Vriezen, T. C., 41f.

Weiser, A., 91.
Widengren, G., 78.
Wifstrand, A., 76.

Index of Scripture Passages

The references do not include the Deutero-Isaianic passages in Chapter IV.

Exodus

XIX 97

Leviticus

XIII. 4, 12, 13, 17 49

Deuteronomy

XXXII. 7 44
18 78

Joshua

IX. 24 28

Judges

IX. 89

1 Samuel

XXIV. 7 98
XXVI. 21 28

2 Samuel

XII 89
XII. 7 93
XIV 89

1 Kings

XX 89
XX. 42. 93

2 Kings

XIV 89

1 Chronicles

XII. 3 41

Ezra

X. 25 41

Job

I. 21 78
IX. 21 28
XXXIX. 17 45

Psalms

II. 2 98
XVII. 2 16
XXIV. 6 44
XXXVII. 6 16
XLIX. 14 49
XC. 15 44
CV. 15 98
CXXXIX. 15 78

Isaiah

I. 2 29
V 89
V. 7 93
VI 25
IX. 8
XI. 8
3—4 17
XXI. 1 43
12 35
XXVII 89
2ff. 96
XXVIII 89
XXXV 65
XL. 1—2 . . . . . 57, 65
3—5 . . . . . 57, 65, 100 f.
6—8 . . . . . 58, 65
9—11 . . . . . 58, 65
12—31 . . . . . 58, 65
XLI. 1 29
1—4 9
1—5 . . . . . 58, 65
2ff. 71
5—7 58
8—13 . . . . . 58, 65
14—16 . . . . . 58, 65
17—20 . . . . . 58, 65, 100
21 99
21—29 . . . . . 18f., 24, 58, 65
25—26 9

27 19
28—29 22
XLII. 1 . . . . . 15, 30, 52
1—4 . . 7, 9, 14—24, 29, 36, 50
1—9 . . . . . 23f., 29
3 . . . . . 15f., 17, 52
4 . . . . . 16, 52f.
5 29
5—(7)9 . . . . . 19—24
6 . . . . 21f., 52f., 55ff., 61
6f. 29
7 29
8 53
9 . . . . . 53, 56
10 19
10—12 . . . . . 24, 59
10—17 . . . . . 59, 65
12 19
14 35
15—16 100
XLII. 18—XLIII. 13 . . . . 59, 65
XLIII. 1—2 100
14—15 . . . . . 59, 65
15 99
16—21 . . . . . 59, 65, 98
19f. 101
XLIII. 22—XLIV. 5 . . . 59f., 65
XLIV. 3—4 100
6 99
6—8. . . . . 60, 65
7 60
9—20 . . . . . 60, 65
21—22 . . . . . 60, 65
23. 30
23—28 . . . . . 60, 65
XLV. 1 97
1ff. 71
1—8 . . . . . 60, 65
9ff. 23
9—13 . . . . . 60, 65
14 98
14ff. 39
14—19 . . . . . 60, 65
20 54
20—25 54
21 56
XLVI. 1—2 . . . . . 61, 65, 72
3—7 . . . . . 61, 65
8—13 . . . . . 61, 65
11. 71
XLVII. 1—15 . . . . . 61, 65, 72
XLVIII. 1—11 . . . . . 56, 66
9 57
12—16 . . . . . 61, 65
17—19 56
20—21 31
20—22 . . . . . 61, 65
21 101
XLIX. 1 52
2 57
1—6 . . 7, 9, 24—32, 35f., 50
1—7 . . . . . 30f., 32
3 . . . . . 30, 53
3—6 30
4 30
5 . . . . . 30, 52, 56f.
5—6 57
6 . . . . . 31, 52
7 . . . . 27—29, 31, 52f., 61
7—9 27
8 . . . . . 27, 31, 61
8—21 . . . . . 31, 61
9—11 101
14 . . . . . .31, 61
21, 22 31
22f. 98
22—23 . . . . . 61, 65
24—25 23
24—26 . . . . . 62, 65
L. 1—3 . . . . . 36, 62, 65
2, 3 99
4—9 . . . . . 7, 9, 32—37, 50
4—11 . . . . . 32, 36, 55f.
7, 8, 9, 10 54
10. 55
10—11 . . . . . 33—37, 49
11. 53
LI. 1 36
1—3 . . . . . 36, 62, 65
4 . . . . . 16, 22
4—6 54
6 99
7—8 . . . . . 55f.
9—11 . . . . . 62, 65, 98
12—16 . . . . . 62, 65
17—23 . . . . . 62, 65
LII. 1—6 . . . . . 62, 65
7—12 . . . . . 50, 62, 65

7 99
13 . . . . . 38, 52
13—15 . . . . . 37f.
14 53
14—15 38
15 . . . . . 40f., 52f.
LII. 13—LIII. 1 . . . . . 42, 47f.
LII. 13—LIII. 12 . . 7, 9, 13, 37—51
LIII. 1 . . . . . 39f.
2 . . . . . 42f.
2ff. 43f., 53
2—12 . . . . . 44, 46, 48, 50
4f. 52
5 49
7—9 44
8 . . . . . 44, 49
9 . . . . . 44, 54
10 . . . . . 45f., 52
10—12 . . . . . 45, 55
11 . . . . . 45f., 52
12 46
LIV. 1—10 . . . . . 50, 62, 65
10 99
11—17 . . . . . 62, 65
13ff. 96
LV. 1—5 . . . . . 55f.
6—7 57
8—13 . . . . . 62f., 65, 69
12f. 101
LX 65
LXI 25, 65
LXII 65
LXIII 89

Jeremiah

I 25
17 25
II. 27 78
IV 89
27 93
X. 22 43
XIII 90
9, 13 93
XV 25
XVII 25
XX 25
9 25
XXXI. 15 45
33—34 60
XLVIII. 40 43
XLIX. 22 43
LI. 10 16

Ezekiel

I—III 25
VIII. 2 43
XV 90
6 93
XVII 91
XIX 91
XXIII 91
XXIV 91
XXXII. 10 28
XXXVII 91
12, 19 93

Daniel

VII. 13 43

Hosea

I, III . . . . . 91f.

Habakkuk

I. 4, 7 16
III. 13 98

Zephaniah

III. 5 33

Zechariah

I—VI 91
VI. 9ff. 91

Ecclesiasticus

XL. 1f. 78

Psalms of Solomon

V. 3 86

John

X 80

1 Peter

I. 24f. 58, 87

SPEEDY BINDER
Manufactured by
GAYLORD BROS.
Syracuse, N. Y.
Stockton, Calif.

DATE DUE

JAN 28 1994
APR 12 2005
FEB 05 2004
DEC 08 2005
MAR 9 2005
MAY 2 2006

GAYLORD PRINTED IN U.S.A.

BS
1520
L5

GTU Library
BS1520 .L5 G
Lindblom, Johannes/The servant songs in
3 2400 00052 1702

GTU Library
2400 Ridge Road
Berkeley, CA 94709
For renewals call (510) 649-2500
All items are subject to recall.